



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Br 2218.26.14

Harvard College Library



**FROM THE
J. HUNTINGTON WOLCOTT
FUND**

**GIVEN BY ROGER WOLCOTT [CLASS
OF 1870] IN MEMORY OF HIS FATHER
FOR THE "PURCHASE OF BOOKS OF
PERMANENT VALUE, THE PREFERENCE
TO BE GIVEN TO WORKS OF HISTORY,
POLITICAL ECONOMY AND SOCIOLOGY"**



Lord Rosebery

His Life and Speeches

Lord Rosebery

His Life and Speeches

BY

THOMAS F. G. COATES

WITH TWO PHOTOGRAVURES AND . . .
SIXTEEN PORTRAITS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

IN TWO VOLS.

VOL. I.

London

HUTCHINSON AND CO

Paternoster Row

1900

~~6455.6~~

Br 2218.26.14

Molcott fund
(2 vols)

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON, & VINEY, LD.
LONDON AND AYLESBURY

6455.6
2218.26.14

P R E F A C E

L ORD ROSEBERY no longer leads a party ; but he remains one of the foremost men in the country, and exercises perhaps unsurpassed influence at home and abroad. His movements are followed with keen interest, his possibilities of renewed political power are constantly discussed, and it seems a fitting moment, on the eve of a general election, to present a book which describes his public career, and includes speeches which indicate the aims he has in view.

So far as the speeches of Lord Rosebery are concerned, there will be found within these two volumes a selection from his utterances in Parliament, in the country, and in the Colonies, from the day he first addressed the House of Lords in 1871 to the present time. Many of those speeches are reproduced by permission of Lord Rosebery and the *Times*, and my

hearty thanks for this privilege are due to his lordship and to Mr. Moberley Bell. My thanks are also specially due to Sir John R. Robinson, manager of the *Daily News*, for his permission to reproduce from the columns of that newspaper many reports of speeches and quotations from articles, and to Messrs. J. Ritchie & Co., of the *Scotsman*, for a similar privilege in regard their journal.

I have further to acknowledge my great indebtedness to the proprietors of *Punch*, *Vanity Fair*, the *Westminster Gazette*, and to Mr. F. Carruthers Gould for permission to reproduce their cartoons.

This work will, it is hoped, prove of value at the present time to those who are interested in public questions and political contests.

T. F. G. C.

"THE GROVE,"

ST. MARGARET'S, TWICKENHAM,

September 1900.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
IS HE A DREAMER OF DREAMS?—LORD ROSEBERY'S UNIQUE POSITION—THE EX-PREMIER'S IDEALS—A PARTY OF PROGRESS—"A PLAGUE ON POLITICS! COME DOWN AND DO SOMETHING FOR THE PEOPLE!"—THE TEST OF GOVERNMENTS	I

CHAPTER II

BIRTH AND PARENTAGE—INHERITED LOVE OF SPORT—THE MIDDLE CLASSES FIFTY YEARS AGO—PICTURE OF A TRADESMAN'S LIFE—INTERESTING ADDRESS BY LORD DALMENY, M.P.—A TALENTED AND BEAUTIFUL MOTHER—HER LITERARY WORK—A PRIMROSE LECTURE ON ART.	13
---	----

CHAPTER III

DISTINGUISHED ANCESTRY—NOTABLE PRIMROSES OF THE PAST—THEIR TASTES AND DOINGS IN STIRRING TIMES—THE GRANTING OF THE PEERAGES—THE HOUSING PROBLEM—A PICTURE OF THE POOR FIFTY YEARS AGO	34
---	----

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOLBOY—AT BRIGHTON—FAGGING AT ETON—POACHING EGGS FOR MR. ACLAND—A DEFENCE OF THE SYSTEM OF FAGGING—SPEAKING AT THE ETON SOCIETY—HIS SCHOOLMASTER'S APPRECIATION—MR. CORY'S LETTERS—"ANYHOW, HE WILL BE AN ORATOR"—"SUCH A MAN AS THE POETS DELIGHT IN"—"FLOREAT ETONA!"	58
--	----

CHAPTER V

	PAGE
UNDERGRADUATE DAYS AT OXFORD—ANTIQUATED CUSTOMS— THE DAYS OF REFORM—DEAN LIDDELL'S IMPROVEMENTS— SOCIAL DISTINCTIONS ABOLISHED—THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPORT—A DIFFICULTY ABOUT HORSES	90

CHAPTER VI

DEATH AND FUNERAL OF THE FOURTH EARL—SUCCESSION TO THE PEERAGE—WORK AND STUDY—THE POLITICAL ARENA —THE QUEEN OPENS PARLIAMENT—A BRILLIANT SCENE— LORD ROSEBERY'S FIRST SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS —COMPLIMENTS OF STATESMEN AND JOURNALISTS	96
---	----

CHAPTER VII

EARLY DAYS IN PUBLIC LIFE—A LISTENER AT FIRST—LADAS AND THE DERBY—GAMBLING AND HORSE-RACING—SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT—AN ELECTION SCENE—SPEECHES IN THE COUNTRY—THE YOUNG EARL AND THE LADIES—EDINBURGH PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY—"THE UNION OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND"	123
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII

INTEREST IN FOREIGN QUESTIONS—THE ALABAMA CASE— MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS—SCOTCH EDUCATION—LIFE PEER- AGES—CHURCH PATRONAGE—LORD ROSEBERY AND MR. TOOLE, THE ACTOR—ROYAL TITLES	145
--	-----

CHAPTER IX

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN—WORK FOR THE ARTISANS IN LONDON—RELATIONS WITH THE REV. HENRY SOLLY—THE CLUB AND INSTITUTE MOVEMENT—THE REPUB- LICAN AND "MR." ROSEBERY—THE SOCIAL SCIENCE CON- GRESS—PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS—RELATIONS OF CAPITAL AND LABOUR	160
--	-----

Contents of Vol. I

ix

CHAPTER X

PAGE

ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE TO MISS HANNAH DE ROTHSCHILD —A BRILLIANT CEREMONY—SOME WEDDING PRESENTS— LORD RECTORSHIPS, ABERDEEN AND EDINBURGH—ELOQUENT ADDRESSES—SCOTTISH HISTORY, ASSOCIATIONS, AND CHARAC- TERISTICS—A DISCOURSE ON PATRIOTISM	203
---	-----

CHAPTER XI

PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN LORD ROSEBERY'S EARLY PARLIAMENTARY LIFE—THE ELECTION OF 1878—GLADSTONE AND DISRAELI— IRISH CHURCH DISESTABLISHMENT—CIVIL SERVICE REFORMS —THE ELECTION OF 1874—MR. GLADSTONE'S FIRST RETIRE- MENT—THE EASTERN QUESTION—SPEECHES ON FOREIGN POLICY	284
---	-----

CHAPTER XII

THE FIRST MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN—PREPARING FOR MR. GLAD- STONE—SPEECH AT HAWICK—"IMPERIUM ET LIBERTAS"— THE DUTY OF VOTERS—LORD ROSEBERY'S ILLNESS—THE SECOND MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN—ROSEBERY VERSUS BUC- CLEUCH—"WATCHWORDS OF LIBERAL POLICY"—"PEACE AND FREEDOM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD"—THE LIBERAL VICTORY—"THE UNCROWNED KING OF SCOTLAND"	323
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII

AFTER THE 1880 ELECTION—MR. GLADSTONE'S SECOND PREMIER- SHIP—LORD ROSEBERY'S REFUSAL OF OFFICE—SUBSEQUENT ACCEPTANCE—UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT—THE IRISH QUESTION—AGRARIAN TROUBLES —COERCION MEASURES—GLADSTONE AND PARNELL—ASSAS- INATION OF LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH AND MR. BURKE —FOUNDATION OF THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB—DIS- ABILITIES OF PEERS—LORD ROSEBERY'S RESIGNATION—A NEW DEPARTMENT OF STATE—THE SECRETARY FOR SCOT- LAND ACT.	352
--	-----

Contents of Vol. I

CHAPTER XIV

PAGE

A TOUR ROUND THE WORLD—THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES— MOTHER AND DAUGHTER COUNTRIES—"A MARRIAGE OF THE AFFECTIONS"—BASIS OF EMPIRE—"THE PASSION OF MY LIFE"—A BUSY AUTUMN—GREAT SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT—THE FRANCHISE BILL—REDISTRIBUTION— RELATION OF LORDS AND COMMONS—INDEPENDENT PEERS AND "RECKLESS DEMAGOGUES"—AN URGENT APPEAL . . .	382
--	-----

CHAPTER XV

BRIGHT DAYS AT DALMENY—A ROYAL VISIT—TREE PLANTING ON THE LAWN BY PRINCE AND PRINCESSES—MR. GLAD- STONE'S VISIT—THE MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1884— NOTES BY "TOBY, M.P."—THE G.O.M., THE AXE, AND THE OAK TREES—LORD ROSEBERY AT THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS—THE FREEDOM OF ABERDEEN—A LETTER TO THE LORDS	420
---	-----

CHAPTER XVI

THE SOUDAN EXPEDITION—GORDON'S MISSION—CAPTURE OF KHARTOUM AND MASSACRE OF THE GARRISON—LORD ROSE- BERY AND MR. GLADSTONE—THE SPEECH AT EPSOM—LORD PRIVY SEAL AND FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS—LORD ROSEBERY A CABINET MINISTER—FIRMNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY—THE THREATENED WAR WITH RUSSIA—PEACE SECURED—DEFEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT—SCOTTISH LIBERALS AND THE EARL	438
---	-----

CHAPTER XVII

THE 1885 ELECTION—MR. GLADSTONE AND LORD ROSEBERY— THE TORIES AND THE PARNELLITES—THE POLITICAL UM- BRELLA—"WHAT IS A LIBERAL?"—"I AM A FOLLOWER OF MR. GLADSTONE"—LIBERAL IMPERIALISM DEFINED— THE FREEDOM OF KILMARNOCK—MR. GLADSTONE AND IRELAND—MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S "UNAUTHORISED PRO- GRAMME"—THE RESULT OF THE ELECTION—IRISH suc- CESSES—THE TORY GOVERNMENT—MR. GLADSTONE RETURNS TO POWER	475
--	-----

ILLUSTRATIONS IN VOL. I

✓ <i>Frontispiece.</i> LATEST PORTRAIT OF LORD ROSEBERY.	PAGE	7
✓ THE LADY WILHELMINA STANHOPE (THE DUCHESS OF CLEVELAND), LORD ROSEBERY'S MOTHER.	25	
✓ LORD ROSEBERY AS AN OXFORD UNDERGRADUATE	93	
✓ THE LATE LADY ROSEBERY	205	
✓ CARTOON OF LORD ROSEBERY FROM "VANITY FAIR," JUNE 3, 1876	305	
✓ MENTMORE TOWERS	361	
✓ DALMENY CASTLE	417	
✓ BARBOUGLE CASTLE	475	

LORD ROSEBERY

His Life and Speeches

CHAPTER I

IS HE A DREAMER OF DREAMS?—LORD ROSEBERY'S UNIQUE POSITION—
THE EX-PREMIER'S IDEALS—A PARTY OF PROGRESS—"A PLAGUE
ON POLITICS !—COME DOWN AND DO SOMETHING FOR THE PEOPLE !"
—THE TEST OF GOVERNMENTS

THE Earl of Rosebery is a man of many parts. Few have equalled him in the versatility of his genius. He is the head of the Primrose family, which for centuries has given to the country men of capacity in various walks of life. Some of them have been men of distinction. He has already been Prime Minister. Later, he chose to withdraw from the leadership of the Liberal party and from political life. The position he has since held has been unique. The retired politician, however brilliant his achievements, is a man who, as a rule, is soon almost forgotten.

2 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

Not so with Lord Rosebery. On the contrary, every year since his withdrawal from the active political field, his influence in the country and his hold upon the people have increased. He has been the man most talked about and most thought about for the last few years. His position has been described as that of Public Orator for the country and for the Empire. In years when long reports of speeches have been the exception and not the rule, it is a remarkable tribute to the value of his words and the interest of the public in him, that, with the two exceptions of the Prince of Wales and the present Premier, the Marquis of Salisbury, he is the only man in England whose remarks are invariably published in the first person in the great daily newspapers of the country. And whenever he has spoken of later years it has been recognised almost universally that he has given voice, with an eloquence and power peculiarly his own, to the feelings and sentiments of the great bulk of the nation. Whatever be men's views as to political questions and to questions of national policy abroad which partisanship does not affect, whatever be in that party, of which he was once the head, the views of particular sections as to particular men, there is found on every hand the conviction that, notwithstanding his withdrawal for a time from political life, the future of the country cannot be separated from the great personality of Lord Rosebery.

This is a day of transition. Men recognise that there are great problems, especially as regards Imperial and social questions, which will have to be faced in the near future; and as to many of them, men's minds have not been made up. They rightly look for guidance to those men whose capacities and experience give the right, and render it a duty, that they should show the way. It would seem to many that it is the duty of a leader to lead. Men like Mr. Gladstone and his deliberately designated successor, Lord Rosebery, have often indicated that they felt it rather to be the duty of the leaders to follow—when the people had made up their minds. That is their duty, no doubt. Yet, surely, when guidance is wanted, those best able to give it cannot be justified in withholding it. True, Lord Rosebery has in name ceased to be a leader; nevertheless, the nation recognises him as one still. The future must be left to show in what capacity Lord Rosebery will maintain a position which his own will alone, but not that of the people, took from him a few years ago.

Whilst he was Prime Minister, a sketch of Lord Rosebery was written by Mr. Arthur Wallace,¹ who said: "Lord Rosebery is one of the men who dream dreams. When he ceases to dream, he thinks the time will have come to give up being a Reformer."

¹ "Lord Rosebery: His Words and His Work." By Arthur Wallace. London: Henry J. Deane.

4 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

Mr. Wallace was paraphrasing a remark made in one of his speeches by the popular Earl. Well, we have seen some dreams of Lord Rosebery realised, and others are in process of development. Was Imperial Federation, with which the name of Lord Rosebery has been so closely identified, a mere dream? Many believed that it was. The Imperial Federation League, which Lord Rosebery helped to found and for long led, died; yet the past session of Parliament has seen the Australasian Colonies drawn together under just such a scheme as is one of the ideals of Lord Rosebery. And in connection with the South African war we have seen the whole Empire, white men everywhere, and "men of colour" in the great dependency of India, most anxious to stand together and fight shoulder to shoulder under the Union Jack. The dream of Imperial Federation is well on the way to complete realisation. To Lord Rosebery "the British Empire is the greatest secular agency for good ever known to mankind." "Since I traversed," he remarked at Leeds in 1888, "those great regions which own the sway of the British Crown outside these islands, I have felt that there was a cause which merits all enthusiasm and energy men can give it. It is a cause for which any one might be content to live; it is a cause for which, if needs be, one might be content to die." And again: "The future of civilisation rests with the Anglo-Saxon race. . . .

No race, no nation of old time, whether Jew, or Greek, or Roman, had any such record as ours, and none approached our possibilities."

As an Imperialist, Lord Rosebery has seen the conviction grow and become almost unanimous that there is a true Imperialism which is as far removed from Jingoism as that of "Little Englandism." His Imperial views have been no mere dream. "Government of the Empire by the Empire for the Empire" we are beginning to better understand, and its real meaning is very much like the true spirit of "Government of the people by the people for the people," of which we always hear so much at election times.

Is Lord Rosebery a mere dreamer as to social reforms? In the next chapter I quote at some length from a leading article which appeared in *The Times* newspaper on the day that Lord Rosebery was born. It is all about the pitiable condition of the poor in London and the other large cities of the country. It was considered then that the fear of interfering with any "privileges" of certain classes stopped the way of reform by legislation. To-day there is a new spirit abroad. We have learned to use the machinery of the law and the powers of the local governing bodies to deal with insanitary areas, to ensure that the poor shall live under healthier conditions. And of this new collectivist spirit that makes men think of the welfare of others as well as of themselves, Lord

6 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

Rosebery has dreamed as follows, to quote from one of his Ministerial speeches :

"To what do you attribute that spirit? I attribute it to two things. In the first place I believe, as England has been governed under various suffrages for the benefit of various sections, that, now the suffrage has been made accessible to all, it is about to be governed for all. In the next place I believe, in the further course of the lowering of that suffrage we somewhere or other light upon the conscience of the community. I believe that at last the community has awoke to its liabilities and duties to all ranks and classes. And I believe the people are now inclined to think that politics is not merely a game at which the pawns have to be sacrificed to the knights and the castles, but is an elevating and ennobling effort to carry into practical affairs and practical life the principles of a higher morality. I believe that, increasingly, Governments will be judged by that test. I believe the people are coming to recognise that in that spirit alone must Governments be carried on. It is all very well to make great speeches and to win great divisions. It is well to speak with authority in the councils of the world, and to see your navies riding on every sea, and to see your flag on every shore. That is well, but it is not all. I am certain that there is a party in this country, not named as yet, that is disconnected with any existing political

organisation, a party which is inclined to say, 'A plague on both your Houses, a plague on all your parties, a plague on all your politics, a plague on your unending discussions which yield so little fruit! Have done with this unending talk, and come down and do something for the people!' It is this spirit which animates, as I believe, the great masses of our artisans, the great masses of our working clergy, the great masses of those who work for and with the poor, and who, for the want of a better word, I am compelled to call by the bastard term of philanthropists ; and whether that spirit be with them or not—and I am convinced, by conversation with many individuals, it is increasingly so—you will find that that spirit will spread, if Parliament is not able to do something effective—you will find it will spread higher and wider in the social scale ; and I, for one, shall not despair some day to see a Minister, Prime or otherwise, who shall not scruple, from time to time, to come down from the platform of party and speak straight to the hearts of his fellow-countrymen—speak to them as Sir Robert Peel spoke to them when he was hurled from power for cheapening the bread of the people. Were that Minister here to-night, he would, I imagine, ask you not to save his Cabinet or himself, but to make a great effort to save yourselves, to save yourselves by some noble, by some direct, by some effective action, from the

8 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

dangers that encircle a great population—the perils of violence, of crime, and the greatest peril of all, the peril of ignorance. We ask you to rob no class, to rob no man ; but we do say that, unless effective means are taken to deal with this enormous, this incalculable population which is growing up around us, half noticed, half ignored, there is a danger for England such as war has never given her, and which it is the prayer of this Government she may escape.”

There is, as Mr. Wallace remarked, “the ideal ; is it possible to translate any portion of it into the real ?” In the six years that have passed away since that question was asked, it seems to me that rapid progress has been made, showing that the ideal may well be accomplished. Already much has been done with the approval of all classes in London for the benefit and health of the community. The lungs of London have been purified by the work of the London County Council. The people of the metropolis are learning at last that it is something to be a citizen of the great city. The man who dreamed of the ideal which his words described did more than any man to strengthen the newly formed London County Council for its work by his personal influence, efforts, and example. And if the statesman who dreams and who has worked so ably thinks that a political party to carry out his social collectivist ideals must have a new name, may he not well

look, not to the phrase "Liberal Imperialist," the meaning of which it is so easy to distort and to misunderstand, but to that term "Progressive Party" which would embody so comprehensively what broad-minded reformers of all classes desire to see accomplished in the future? The Progressives on the County Council, with Lord Rosebery at their head, have accomplished great reforms not only by the strength of their own party, but with the approval and aid of numbers who in name were and are their opponents. Shall we see Lord Rosebery lead a Progressive party to a general election, to win a victory that will place him as Progressive Prime Minister of a Progressive Government and Parliament, in the best position to realise dreams which so many reformers share with him?

Lord Rosebery has not only dreamed dreams and seen their whole or partial fulfilment; he has dispelled others. There was one that Liberalism and a sound strong foreign policy were dissociated.

It was in 1886 that he first took the foreign portfolio. He had been Under-Secretary at the Home Office from 1881 to 1883, Lord Privy Seal and Chief Commissioner of Works in 1885. As Foreign Secretary under the Premiership of Mr. Gladstone in the first Home Rule administration in 1886 he greatly distinguished himself, and won for his party the credit of maintaining a firm,

dignified, and safe conduct of our relations with foreign nations. He believed in the continuity of our foreign policy, holding, as he expressed later on, the view that they should be removed outside of party bias, and that the Foreign Minister must be the mouthpiece not so much of his party, but as of the entire nation. A firm dispatch to Russia regarding the freedom of the port of Batoum showed the mettle he was made of, and that the "squeezability" which has been the fault of more than one of our Foreign Ministers of late years was no part of his constitution. In Mr. Gladstone's fourth administration in 1892 he held the same office, and at once showed the strength and independence of his character. During this second tenure of the office he had enormous difficulties to contend with, and on the whole increased his reputation, notwithstanding the troublesome matter with France in regard to Siam, in which he certainly did not seem to get the best of the arrangements which were made for the settlement of serious differences. But on the whole Lord Rosebery gained, and has ever since retained, a great reputation as a strong and skilful Foreign Minister, a reputation which, if he should return to the political field, will undoubtedly increase the strength of the party of which so many think he is the only possible successful leader.

In the following pages I shall give as complete a record as I have been able to compile and

compress within reasonable space of his life from infancy to the days when he became Prime Minister, to the later day when he astonished the country by retiring from the leadership of his party, and to the day when, as I have mentioned, his speeches, though of late not frequent, have possessed such interest and have so fully given expression to the national sentiments, that he has even been styled the Public Orator of the Empire. ✓
Of him I join with Mr. Arthur Wallace in saying : " Like Pitt, Lord Rosebery lives in a great epoch. Will he prove equal to the demands made of him? Of his devotion to his country, of his purity of motive, of his courage, few can entertain a moment's doubt. His speeches are pregnant with high aspirations and inspiring thought, and on his power of giving effect to the worthier and more permanent part of them depends his future and the verdict of history on his work." That because a few years ago he retired from the leadership of the Liberal party his days of political work are over, I do not believe. Nor, I think, does any one else. But when will he return? I wish I could answer, " I know it will be soon." Probably it will only be when the Liberal party has learned the lesson which Lord Rosebery has urged upon them : that unity is strength. When that will be, whether soon or late, only the Liberal party can determine.

In his farewell speech at Edinburgh, after his

12 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

resignation of the leadership, Lord Rosebery remarked that his sacrifice would have been in vain if it did not bring unity to the Liberal party. It has not produced that result. If Lord Rosebery were to come out from his tent to the political battlefield again at the present time, many think that unity would be given and strength found.

CHAPTER II

BIRTH AND PARENTAGE—INHERITED LOVE OF SPORT—THE MIDDLE CLASSES FIFTY YEARS AGO—PICTURE OF A TRADESMAN'S LIFE—INTERESTING ADDRESS BY LORD DALMENY, M.P.—A TALENTED AND BEAUTIFUL MOTHER—HER LITERARY WORK—A PRIMROSE LECTURE ON ART

THE present and fifth Earl of Rosebery was born on Friday, May 7, 1847, at No. 20, Charles Street, Berkeley Square, and the event was thus announced in *The Times* and other newspapers of the following day : "On the 7th inst., in Charles Street, Lady Dalmeny, of a son and heir."

A few days later there was published the further announcement that "Lady Dalmeny and her infant son and heir are progressing as favourably as could be desired," and from that day until September, 1861, when he addressed a few words to his grandfather's tenants at Dalmeny on the occasion of a volunteer review in Dalmeny Park, the newspapers made no further mention of the lad who was destined, before he had reached the age of fifty, to hold office as the Queen's Prime Minister. Looking back upon his interesting career, not without the wonder whether the valuable work accomplished and the brilliant promises of early

days are not destined to have an even more brilliant sequel, it is worthy of note that there were some who early recognised that exceptional capacities were the lad's possession. It is the custom when men become great for a number of persons to declare that they have foreseen and predicted the honours the future was to bring. Such assertions as a rule have but a shadowy foundation. It is, however, the fact that it is recorded that when Lord Dalmeny, at the age of fourteen, had been heard to deliver a schoolboy speech, Mr. James Dundas, of Dundas, an old friend and neighbour of the Roseberys, ventured to prophecy that the speaker would become a future Prime Minister; while it is impossible to read the appreciations of his old schoolmaster, Mr. Cory, which will be subsequently referred to, without becoming convinced that in his earliest days there were evidences afforded of the exceptional abilities of the young peer.

Lord Rosebery had not the privilege of knowing, except as an infant, his father, who died in January, 1851. Lord Dalmeny had been staying at Dalmeny Park in the previous December, and was seized with sudden illness. The malady was pleurisy. A fatal ending was not anticipated. A steady improvement was at first, and a rapid recovery soon afterwards, recorded. On January 24 he went out driving. The next day he died suddenly from failure of the heart.

Lord Dalmeny was born in 1809, and died, consequently, in his forty-second year. In 1843 he had married Catherine Lucy Wilhelmina, only daughter of Philip Henry, fourth Earl Stanhope. He was a steady supporter of the Liberal party, and sat in Parliament as member for the Stirling Burghs from 1832 to 1847, having to fight for his seat several times. He held office as a Lord of the Admiralty from 1835 till the fall of the Melbourne Ministry in 1841. He was a man of strong character, fond of literature, and himself an able writer. His skill and power with the pen, and his qualities as a keen observer of the customs of his time were indicated in a pamphlet issued in 1848 and entitled, "An Address to the Middle Classes upon the Subject of Gymnastic Exercises." The remarks of the father will be read with interest as showing that Lord Rosebery's love of sport of all kinds was clearly inherited from his father, who doubtless would have been especially pleased if he had lived to see how thoroughly the middle classes learned the lesson he sought to teach. How delighted, too, he would have been could he have lived to see his son presenting prizes to a successful football team at the Crystal Palace, and the proud possessor of the winner of the Derby, and to see a grandson distinguishing himself with the bat at an Eton and Harrow contest at Lords!

Lord Dalmeny's pamphlet appears in a volume of "Tracts Relating to Gymnastic Exercises," and is the only one in English which the book contains. The others are either by German or French authors, written in the language of their countries. Lord Dalmeny's able address runs to over fifty pages, and is full of interesting description and careful argument, urging the middle classes to change their ways and to become an athletic people. He wrote :

"In this age of philanthropic theory and domestic reform, when nations, laying aside their mutual antipathies, apply to internal improvement those energies formerly devoted to ambition,—at the present moment especially when, while other States are constructing or remodelling their political institutions, England has embarked in the career of social regeneration, when the material and moral condition of her population not only attracts the speculations of her philosophers, but occupies the labours of her legislators, when the public health and the public comfort are an object of the public concern, when not only were sanitary schemes proposed, but sanitary measures adopted,—no man ought to withhold any suggestions or ideas which may be serviceable to his fellow-citizens or promote the welfare of society.

"It is on this ground that I venture to address you upon Exercise—a subject than which few are more important and none more neglected.

Numerous plans have been devised for improving the dwellings of the people and for affording them the means of personal cleanliness. Where these plans have been carried into effect, they have been attended with such advantage as to encourage their extension. But none have been proposed for providing the inhabitants of large towns with the means of physical recreation and vigorous exercise, without which the success of the best sanitary code will be but partial and incomplete.

“ It is a common belief that the sanitary measures which are to unload the drains and purify the atmosphere of our large cities will of themselves be sufficient to ensure the health and vigour of the whole community to which their enactments may apply. No doubt these measures will, in many localities, be effectual in preventing the invasion of epidemics, in mitigating the ravages of disease, and in delaying the visitation of death. Legislation can do much to alleviate the afflictions and reduce the mortality of mankind. It may shield the whole nation from the breath of pestilence. It may purge the air of noxious exhalations. It may proscribe and banish that hideous family of plagues which have their origin in accumulations of filth, deleterious effluvia, and foul habitations. It may remove miasma, that corrupts the blood and offends the senses.

“ Legislation can do much, but it cannot do all. I have stated what it can do ; I will now state

what it cannot do. It cannot protect any man against that state of debility and disease which is the inevitable consequence of his own luxury and sloth. If it supplies him with a pure atmosphere, it cannot force him to practise the temperance and adopt those habits of exercise which are indispensable to health. . . . In fact, health cannot be secured and guaranteed by Act of Parliament. Such are the habits of our middle classes that they would be far from possessing it if they enjoyed the air of the Grampians. It is not so much additional air as additional exercise that they require.

"I address these remarks to the middle classes because it is to the middle classes that they are peculiarly applicable. The lower classes are condemned by necessity to undergo the toil to which the upper resort for the sake of exercise or diversion. Poverty compels the one, pleasure prompts the other, to adopt the habits and enjoy the benefit of physical exertion. The daily labour for daily bread maintains the vigour of the labourer. The chase, the gun, the foil preserve the health of the gentleman. Both these classes, no doubt, abound in exceptions. Unfortunately, what is the exception with the extreme classes is the rule of the middle classes; and hence I venture to offer it a few words of warning and advice."

Lord Dalmeny then drew the following picture of the daily life of a British tradesman of the day :

"In a political and moral point of view, it is no doubt entitled to the highest commendation. It is a pattern of industry, punctuality, and good faith. But if we contemplate it under its sanitary aspect we shall find that it deserves more censure than praise. What is his daily life? He rises early and begins business at eight o'clock, having opened his shop before the majority of his customers have opened their eyes. At nine he eats a hasty breakfast, and immediately returns to his business. By business he is engrossed till two, when he swallows a beefsteak and returns to business. At five he withdraws from business for a brief interval to tea, when, having gulped down some cups of souchong, he returns again to business. He continues immersed in business till eight or nine, when he begins to think that business may yield the place to relaxation or amusement.

"What is the nature of this relaxation or amusement? Does he brace his nerves, reanimate his spirits, or circulate his blood by any gymnastic exercise, any invigorating game? Nothing of the kind. If fond of literature or politics, he retires to read the last review or study the leading article in *The Times*. If he be convivial, he strives with a few boon companions to relieve the pressure of anxiety and escape the persecutions of care. If he be domestic, he seeks on the household hearth the solace of conversation and repose. Heaven forbid that I should denounce any one of these

habits, that I should attempt to decry the pleasures derived from society, from home, from intellectual employment. It is this blending of business and domestic habits that has made England what she is—the mart and model of the world, the emporium of all trade, the asylum of freedom and order, the shrine of public and private virtue.

“I am not about to propose any plan which will obstruct or interfere with business, with domestic enjoyments, or intellectual pursuits. I would merely suggest certain descriptions of physical amusement, which might be harmoniously combined with other important avocations, which would restore the health which you have lost or impart a health which you have never experienced, which would infuse an energy and vigour previously unfelt and unknown. I would avert the impending degeneracy, whose immediate invasion is threatened by the progress of luxury and care.

“In other countries the tendency is to think too much of diversions and too little of work. Here the tendency is the reverse: to devote our whole attention to business and none to recreation. The free citizens of England are the voluntary slaves of toil, which is never, as in the case of those who are the property of others, diversified by amusement. We are indeed rich in literary and scientific societies, mechanic reading-clubs, schools of philosophy and art; rich in institutions for bewildering and oppressing the overwrought

brains of our middle and operative classes with crude speculations and ill-digested knowledge. But where are the institutions for gymnastics? Where are the associations for physical exercise? Where are the arenas where the limbs, the sinews, the spirits of our merchants may be recreated and refreshed by manly diversions? Where are the noble sports of our ancestors? Where are the rude but invigorating pastimes which hardened their muscles, steeled their nerves, expanded their frames, exhilarated their spirits, and gladdened their hearts?

“What sports are there now to smooth the brow of care, to dispel the vapours of spleen, to make poverty forget its wretchedness, or sorrow smile amidst its woe?

“We are the wisest, the greatest, but the saddest nation in the world. We throw the responsibility on the climate, and abuse our fogs and murky skies. Yet the climate in the days of Elizabeth was the same as it is now, and ‘merry’ was then the chosen epithet of England. But in those days, when England was not only called ‘merry,’ but was merry, there were numerous popular festivals where the yeomen and burgesses exercised themselves in manly sports. The Stuarts actually attached such importance to the due recreation of the people that they ordered a proclamation to be read every Sunday in the churches permitting, nay, enjoining, the use of pastimes and games.

22 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

This proclamation and its injunctions were proscribed by the Puritans, who, though they rescued our privileges and liberties from destruction, have left no slight taint of their fanaticism and gloom. The national character still displays strong traces of their ascendancy. With that indomitable love of freedom it has retained no small portion of their austerity. Since their days the old sports of England have fallen into disuse, and with these has disappeared the ancient joyousness of its inhabitants. . . .

“ But perhaps it may be said, ‘ All is very well as it is, and where is the necessity for change ? Every large community, every closely thronged city must have its proportion of mortality and sickness. This is the ordination of Providence and the lot of humanity, and why engage in a vain attempt to combat an established and immutable order of things ? ’

“ All is not well, and there is a necessity for change when want of exercise consigns numbers to early disease and premature graves. . . . This doctrine, that all is well that exists, is a dangerous delusion, and is, after all, the lazy excuse of those spurious philosophers who avert their faces from abuses to escape the trouble of reforming them.”

Lord Dalmeny urged that gymnastics should form an indispensable part of the education of youth, and went so far as to suggest that as every parish had its church, its baths, its workhouse, and

its school, so ought it to have its gymnasium. For gymnastics he adopted Webster's definition, "Athletic exercises intended for the promotion of health and diversion."

What the father so ably urged, the son has indeed done much to bring about by his words and by his example. How thoroughly the nation learned the lesson Lord Rosebery's father tried to teach was briefly referred to by the son in the course of a speech delivered at the opening of a free library at Shepherd's Bush on June 25, 1896. He then remarked:

"I think no one can watch the progress of our nation without seeing the enormous predominance that is given everywhere to-day to outdoor sports. I welcome that tendency. I think it is a healthy and rational tendency; but of course it may be carried too far. What we do see in the tendency to outdoor sport at this time is, that it weans the race from occupations that might be objectionable, and it is rearing a noble and muscular set of human beings; and it sub-serves other objects which are not so immediately apparent. For instance, I take it, the connection between Australia and the mother country has been rendered closer than it would have been otherwise by the cricket contests which take place between the two countries; and I am given to understand, though I have never seen one of the great Northern or Midland football matches, that

they are almost Homeric in their character, in their strenuousness, and the excitement they engender. The rivalry they engender between the various districts of the country furnishes a subject healthy in itself and inspiring to all those who witness it. I hope very soon to see some such match, because I think we have lived in vain if we have not seen one. I have seen the crowds going to those matches, and I have never seen anything in public life or elsewhere comparable to the eagerness and the enthusiasm of those crowds. Then there is bicycling. I suppose nobody, not even the humblest pedestrian with his arm broken or otherwise, is indifferent to the bicyclist. I do not know what particular effect the bicycle may have upon the conformation of posterity. It seems to me it may produce a race of beings of a Z-like shape. But, at any rate, it has produced a race of hardy adventurers such as those by whom our Empire was founded—adventurers perhaps a trifle too hardy, but who would have had no opportunity of visiting the corners of our native land if they had not been furnished with these useful wheels. All that is a most interesting and striking feature of our national life. We have to maintain a great Empire. We have to develop a great Empire, and for Imperial purposes you need a race of muscle, of strength, and of nerve. All these are developed by these sports. But, after all, this is not



**LADY WILHELMINA STANHOPE (THE DUCHESS OF CLEVELAND),
LORD ROSEBERY'S MOTHER.**

everything. An empire cannot live by muscles alone. It must have brains."

Lord Dalmeny's funeral took place at the church of Dalmeny on the Friday following his death, and *The Scotsman* of the following day remarked :

"The death of Lord Dalmeny has left a blank in his family and society which must be long and deeply felt. His amiable disposition and agreeable manners and excellent morals, the religious principle which marked his whole character, the great attainments and high cultivation of his enlarged mind, have endeared his memory to all who had an opportunity of knowing his real worth and of estimating his high qualities."

Such was the father of Lord Rosebery. Of his mother a good deal also should be said, for she is a remarkable woman. Lady Wilhelmina Stanhope has the distinction of being honoured with the Queen's personal friendship. She is now the Duchess of Cleveland, as she married, for the second time, in 1854, Harry George, fourth Duke of Cleveland.

As Lady Wilhelmina Stanhope she was one of the eight maidens of noble birth who bore the train of the Queen at Her Majesty's coronation, and again at the marriage of the Queen.

Writing of her in *The Woman's World* in May, 1897, Sarah A. Tooley says :

"Although the Duchess of Cleveland has never held an official position at Court, and consequently

has not been about the person of the Queen in the intimate manner in which other ladies included in this series ('The Queen's Friends') have been, she was marked out by Her Majesty's friendship, as a girl, in being chosen to attend the young Queen as one of her train-bearers upon the two most important and interesting occasions of her life—her coronation and marriage. In those days the Duchess of Cleveland, whom to-day we know as a wonderful and vivacious old lady, and the mother of a son so distinguished as Lord Rosebery, was the Lady Wilhelmina Stanhope, fourth daughter of Earl Stanhope, and, without exception, the most lovely girl in Society. . . . Lady Wilhelmina appears also to have taken Lockhart by storm when he met her at the Kent County Ball in 1843, and in a letter to Miss Violet Lockhart he confesses that, though the staid father of a family, he had been 'seduced by a Court belle of nineteen—Lady Wilhelmina Stanhope—into dancing till three o'clock in the morning.'"

The same writer adds :

"Not only was the Duchess of Cleveland a celebrated beauty in her youth, but she was as brilliantly clever as she was lovely, and when a mere girl showed great artistic talent, her drawings being quite beyond ordinary amateur productions, and full of dramatic power."

Baroness Bunsen, writing of a dinner-party at Earl Stanhope's in 1842, says :

"Lady Wilhelmina is a very fine creature, and also a very agreeable converser, full of intelligence and information; but I was not prepared for the genius which her drawings denote—original groups from tales; from history; from an imagined cycle of events in a female existence, beginning with babyhood to old age and death; from opera scenes, not servilely adhering to theatrical representation, but giving human beings with human reality of feeling; from ballads, in part, finely illuminated; extraordinary and individual conceptions of beauty, expression without distortion, and a degree of correctness of outline and proportion very rare even among professors of the art."

It is, in fact, only necessary to read and study the illustrations in "The Spanish Lady," a book by the Duchess, to appreciate her excellence both as writer and artist.

The Duchess of Cleveland undertook a valuable historical work which was published in 1889. She prepared the three volumes of "The Battle Abbey Roll, with Some Account of the Norman Lineages." It must have been a stupendous task, which she well accomplished. The work is complete, and the Duchess was the first who ever attempted to deal with the subject so comprehensively. She desired to have a complete work, "for, being a resident at Battle Abbey, and entertaining a higher opinion than is expressed by many of my contemporaries for 'the scum of Bretons and rags of

France' that conquered and colonised England, I have felt an interest in the subject, and a desire to do my best, at all events, towards elucidating it."

The result of her labour was a most interesting work, for, in addition to the mass of facts collected, the picturesque old legends that are a part of the history of many notable families were retained. What would De Vere be without its meteor star, or De Albini without its conquered lion? A vast number of anecdotes, too, are given, furnishing vivid pictures of manners and customs long since passed away, and helping to make the work no mere catalogue of descent, but an interesting and fascinating volume.

The famous roll is believed to have been compiled in obedience to a clause in the Conqueror's foundation charter, that enjoined the monks to pray for the souls of those "who by their labour and valour had helped to win the kingdom (*et pro salute omnium quorum labore et auxilio regnum obtinui, et illorum maxime qui in ipso bello occubuerunt*)."

The great Sussex Abbey that was "the token and pledge of the Royal Crown," had been intended to be not only a memorial of his victory, but a chantry for the slain; and the names of his companions-in-arms, enshrined on this bede-roll, might thus be read out in the church on special occasions, and notably on the anniversary feast of St. Celiet.

The original roll does not exist now, and

it is not known precisely what has become of it; and its accuracy has, moreover, often been impugned. The Duchess describes how from some period shortly after the death of the Conqueror the monks, finding it became an object of ambition to be on the roll, were always found willing to oblige a liberal patron by inserting his name. "Such hath been the subtlety of some monks of old, that, finding it acceptable unto most to be reputed descendants to those who were companions with Duke William in that memorable expedition whereby he became Conqueror of this Realm, as that to gratify them (but not without their own advantage), they inserted their names into this antient catalogue." Thus Dugdale. Camden declares many of the names were forged. Sir Egerton Brydges, in the "Censura Literaria," condemns it as "a disgusting forgery"; Mr. Freeman, "a source of falsehood" and "transparent fiction"; the author of "The Norman People" declares that its date is "a mere myth"; while, not to be outdone, a writer in the Sussex *Archæologia* settles the question according to the summary process by which Garibaldi disposed of the claims of poor St. Peter, and declares that it never existed at all. But the Duchess of Cleveland succeeds in making out a good case for it, and roundly asserts that, so far from being "principally composed" of impostors and intruders, the roll contains not more than ten proved interpolations; and certainly her diligence

and long-continued labours led to the production of three large columns that will be a source of constant delight to those "to whom the great names of the past remain a living memory."

The Duchess of Cleveland's account of Battle Abbey, another work, is a complete record of that grand historical place. The garden is described, as well as the new windows put up in 1876 in Abbotts' Hall, while an accurate ordnance map is included. There is, too, a portrait of Isaac Ingall, who lived with the Webster family at Battle Abbey, where he had been a domestic for upwards of ninety years, and who died April 2, 1798, at the age of one hundred and twenty.

The marriage of Lord Rosebery's parents took place on September 20, 1843, and when Lord Dalmeny died he left his widow with four children: Lady Mary Constance, who married Mr. Henry Walter Hope; Lady Constance Evelyn, who married Lord Leconfield; Colonel Everard Henry Primrose, of the Grenadier Guards, who died at Abu Fatmeh, in Egypt, on April 9, 1885. The third child was the present Earl of Rosebery.

Colonel Primrose, Lord Rosebery's younger brother, inherited from his parents literary and artistic gifts of no mean order. While he was at Cambridge, a student at Trinity College, he delivered a thoughtful lecture on "The History, Progress, and Recent State of Art Education in England," which is especially remarkable for its

merit when it is remembered that the lecturer was only nineteen years of age.

The lecture was delivered at the Old Schools, Pound Hill, Cambridge, on December 4, 1867. In his prefatory observations Mr. Primrose remarked :

“ I have taken especial pains to avoid all arguments about such subjects as can be only referred to questions of propriety and taste ; and I have undertaken to trace, as far as I am able, the gradual development of art in this country, not to point out what I consider to be the correct and most beautiful style. I have therefore abstained from drawing any comparisons between what I might establish as indisputably right, and that which I might condemn as absolutely wrong ; for I consider that it is not only difficult, but even vainglorious, for one man, however educated and refined his taste might be, to seek to determine by his private opinions what others are bound to admire and imitate.

“ It is not by any contrast, however startling, between ideal beauty and actual reality that we can expect any greater artistic feeling to be developed in this country,—for that which some might condemn others might prize, and that which one might deride another might loudly praise,—but it is by a strict adherence to all the guiding principles of Art, and an accurate investigation as to their soundness and truth, that such an object can be attained.

"Art depends as much upon the mind as upon the hands of those who attempt it. It is not a mere question as to what attracts the eye or rivets the attention: I have no doubt but that if it were, many would infinitely prefer the garishness of modern to the mellow tints of ancient works but we have to consider further, when we examine a production, the poetry and sentiment that has called it forth, or the grace that it expresses."

To the establishment of a Royal Academy in 1768, and its development in 1868, Mr. Primrose ascribed a great deal of the advance of painting in England. Towards the end of the address an amusing story was told illustrating how the increase of art in the country and the greater respect that is paid to objects of antiquity have sometimes led to fraud. One of the most peculiar of these frauds was the false story related in *The Cornhill Magazine*. A certain gentleman purchased for £55 a good copy of a Venus painted by Titian, to which he imagined he could ascribe a likeness to Mary Queen of Scots. Having parted with this miniature to a dealer, he happened to mention the fancied likeness he had observed, and was immensely confused to hear afterwards that this auctioneer had resold his copy for £560, as the only miniature ever painted by Titian representing the unfortunate Queen of Scotland. It was exhibited under this title, and

more than a thousand people visited and were credulous enough to believe in its genuineness.

It will be seen from the foregoing that the nearest relatives of the present Earl were men and women of note; and the extracts which have been here given are deserving of particular notice, inasmuch as they have a bearing upon some of his chief characteristics.

CHAPTER III

**DISTINGUISHED ANCESTRY—NOTABLE PRIMROSES OF THE PAST—THEIR
TASTES AND DOINGS IN STIRRING TIMES—THE GRANTING OF THE
PEERAGES—THE HOUSING PROBLEM—A PICTURE OF THE POOR
FIFTY YEARS AGO**

IN the early history of his family Lord Rosebery has taken a deep interest, which has frequently been manifested and has led to public presentations to his lordship, such as that of the Hawick Archæological Society, who, finding in their museum a bronze mortar bearing the inscription, "Gilbert Primros, Chirorgrein, 1569," which had belonged to an ancestor of the Earl of Rosebery, presented it to him, after taking a cast of it for maintenance in their museum.

According to Burke's Peerage, the founder of the family, which derives its surname from the lands of Primrose, County Fife, was Duncan Primrose, "who was seated at Culross in Perthshire in the reign of Queen Mary, and who married Janet, daughter of Main, of Arthur House. They had two sons. Gilbert, the elder, became principal surgeon to James I. and to Queen Anne."

This Gilbert Primrose died in 1615, leaving a

son Gilbert, who became a canon of Windsor and died in 1642, having established a great reputation for learning and piety. He was educated at St. Andrew's University, and subsequently went to France, and was received as a minister of the Reformed Church there, and had a distinguished and useful career. At one time he got into trouble, and was reprimanded by the king of France for petitioning King James, on behalf of the Reformed congregation of Rochelle, to set at liberty Andrew Melville, who was then a prisoner in the Tower of London. It was considered an offence by the French Court for the people of Rochelle to communicate with a foreign sovereign without the knowledge or consent of their own.

In 1623 an Act came into operation forbidding ministers of other nations to officiate in France, and at the National Synod, which met at Charenton in September of that year, the Royal Commissioner presented letters from the French king intimating that Primrose and Cameron were no longer to be employed, "not so much because of their birth as foreigners, as for reasons of State." Deputies were sent to the king to intercede on their behalf, but he would only consent to their remaining in France on the condition that they should resign their offices. Primrose was obliged to quit the country. His banishment was mainly due to the Jesuits, to whom he had given special offence.

On returning to London he was chosen one

of the ministers of the French Church in the metropolis, founded in the time of Edward VI., an appointment which he held till his death; and he was also made Chaplain-in-Ordinary to James I. The University of Oxford gave him the degree of D.D., on the recommendation of the king, ample testimony having been given to his high character and eminence as a theologian. Four years later his royal patron, with whom he was a great favourite, preferred him to a canonry of Windsor.

This eminent divine published in 1623 a "*Panegyrique a tres-grand et tres-puisant Prince Charles, Prince de Galles,*" dedicated to the "*tres-haut et tres-puisant monarque, Jaques I.*" It was written in terms of high flattery such as it was the custom to address to persons of high station in those days. Later, this prolific writer published "*Six Sermons de la Reconciliation de L'Homme Avec Dieu, preschez par Gilbert Primerose, ministre du Saint Evangile, printed at Sedan, 1624,*" with a preface, "*A tres-haut et puissant seigneur, Messire George de Villiers, Grand Admiral, et Grand Escuijer d'Angleterre, Duc de Bouquingam.*" This prefatory note is signed, "*vostre tres-humble, tres-affectionne and tres-obeissant fermiteur, Gilbert Primerose.*" The old printers at Sedan did their work well, and the little book is well worth perusal by those interested in theology. The sermons are full of carefully reasoned argument and lofty thought.

This Gilbert Primrose had a son David, who, after his course at Oxford, entered the ministry, and was appointed to the French Protestant church at Rouen. He wrote in French, and his father translated into English, a work which was printed by Richard Badger "at his shop at the signe of the Glove in Corne Hill, 1636." The volume was a "Treatise on the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, distinguished into four parts, wherein is declared both the nature, originall, and observation, as well of the one under the New as of the other under the Old Testament. Written in French by David Primerose, Batchelour in Divinitie in the University of Oxford and Minister of the Gospel in the Protestant Church of Rouen. Englished out of his French manuscript by his father, G. P., D.D."

The work runs to nearly three hundred and fifty closely printed pages. The translator (or "Englischer," to use the old phrase) addresses a note to the reader which is well worthy of quotation, for the style and line of reason are alike interesting. He writes:

"I wrote to my sonne, preacher of the Gospel at Rouen, desiring him to set downe in a paper (distinctly and clearly) his opinion concerning the Sabbath, with the confirmation thereof by such arguments which hee should thinke most pregnant, and a solide refutation of the contrary arguments, which he did accordingly, but in the French

Tongue, as writing onely out of a dutiful affection to condescend to my desire, not thinking, and far lesse desiring it should be Englished and made publike here: Neither had I any such intention, as being most unwilling that he, who is a stranger to this nation, although not a stranger to the Church should goe formost to break this yce. And therefore I kept it by me three yeeres, till being advertised that others were gone before, and their Bookes were in the Presse, and finding no men that would or could translate it into our Tongue, and take the wearisome pains to place the additions (which he sent me at divers times afterwards) in their roomes: I undertooke this labour my selfe, hoping that things being compared with things, cause with cause, reasons with reasons, and the contrary arguments which are to be found in so many books, for and against the morality of a seventh day of weekly Sabbath, being examined and conferred one by another, the Christian, charitable, and judicious readers should be stirred up, after they have proved all things, to hold fast that which is good, without impairing anything of that religious service which they owe and yeeld publicly in the Church and privately at home with their families to the Lord their God, who heeds not the errours of men (though never so specious) for the upholding of his service. If in this end of my translation I have done anything amisse, I say with David, Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness,

and let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oile, which should not breake mine head."

Having quoted so much of the translator's introductory remarks, it will not be amiss to show the state of the question on which David Primrose wrote and the line he took regarding it, for some of the views are still considered to-day. The question was set up by the author of the treatise as follows:

"(1) All men are bound to serve God every day privately, in some measure, according to his word.

"(2) They are also bound to serve him publikely, and to have a day stinted for his service.

"(3) There is among Godly and learned Christians a great controversie about the originall, nature, and observation of that day.

"(4) Some hold the sanctification and observation of one of the seven days of the week to be morall, and therefore of perpetual necessity, since the beginning unto the end of the world.

"(5) Others maintaine, that the stinting of a day of God's publike service is a point of order, and of ecclesiastical government, depending wholly on institution.

"(6) This treatise made for the defence of this last opinion, is divided into four parts. In the first I shall endeavour to prove that the institution and observation of a seventh day of Sabbath is not morall, that it began not with the beginning of the world, that it had no existence till the people of

Israel were brought from Egypt to the wilderness, and was not known in any part of the universall world till then, and that the Commandement whereby it was confirmed in Horeb, obligeth not under the New Testament. In the second I shall answer all the reasons that I have found alleged for the contrary opinion. In the third I shall discourse of the appointing of Sunday for God's service and shew whence, in greatest likenesse of truth, it taketh its beginning, and establishment in the Christian Church. In the last I will declare what was the cessation of workes enjoined on the Sabbath Day under the Old Testament, and how farre alle are obliged unto it under the New Testament. For these are the principal points that Christians jarre and differ about in this matter of the Sabbath."

Christians of to-day still "jarre and differ" on this subject, and the following general note by the Rev. David Primrose, written nearly three centuries ago, is interesting. He enjoins the Christian "to apply himself to outward actions belonging to the lawfull and honest commodities and pleasures of this decaying and troublesome life, when they doe it with Christian wisdom, which must be the guide of all our actions, leading us so warily, that wee transgresse not the wholesome laws of the State, or of the Church wherein we live, and that we shunne all partialities, and cause of schisme, which is the bane of the Church, dismembering, and

tearing in factious pieces the mysticall body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is the true doctrine of faith and preserved from the poison of mortall heresie."

The second son of Duncan Primrose, the founder of the family, was Archibald, who was employed by the Abbot of Culross in settling the rate of feu-duty to be paid by the vassals of Culross Abbey, and in managing its revenues, a work in which he acquitted himself with great credit. He married Margaret, daughter of Bleau, of Castlehill. They had two sons. James, the younger, was an eminent lawyer, who was appointed by James I., in 1602, Clerk of Privy Council, a post he held for forty years. He married Miss Sibylla Miller, and by her had seven children, of whom Alison, the eldest daughter, married a celebrated Court jeweller, George Heriot. James Primrose was married a second time to Katherine, a daughter of Richard Lawson, of Baghill, and by her had twelve children. His sons by his first wife predeceased him, and he was succeeded by his eldest son by his second marriage, Archibald, who became a baronet and also Lord Carington.

Sir Archibald Primrose lived from 1616 to 1679. He had a stirring career, and remained steadfast to his royal master during the Civil Wars. On September 2, 1641, he succeeded his father as Clerk to the Privy Council, and he acted as Clerk to the Convention of Estates in 1643 and 1644.

After the victory of Kilsyth he joined the army of Montrose, was taken prisoner at Philiphaugh on September 13, 1645, and tried and condemned for treason at the Parliament of St. Andrew's in 1646. He was not, however, to die in consequence of that. His life was spared, but he was kept in confinement till the end of 1646. Then he was released. He again joined the Royalist army, and was knighted by Charles II. He took part in the engagement of 1648, and was on March 10, 1649, deprived of his office of Clerk of the Privy Council by the Act of Classes. Good luck, however, aided him again. He was subsequently reinstated 1651. He accompanied Charles II. on his march to England, and was made a Baronet of Nova Scotia on August 1.

After the battle of Worcester Sir Archibald's estates were sequestrated, and he remained out of office during the Protectorate. The Restoration brought a turn of fortune's wheel in his favour once more, and he was then appointed Lord Clerk Register out of many competitors, having bought off, the " Dictionary of National Biography " states, Sir William Fleming, to whom Charles II. had given a grant of it during his exile.

He prepared " The Laws and Acts of the first Parliament of our Most High and Dread Sovereign Charles the Second, By the Grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith. Holden at Edinburgh the First of

January 1671, By a Noble Lord, John Earl of Middleton, Lord Cleremont and Fettercairn ; His Majesties Commissioner for holding of this Parliament, by vertue of a Commission under His Majesties Great Seal of this Kingdom, with the special advice and consent of the Estates of Parliament. Extracted and collected from the records of Parliament, by Sir Archibald Primrose of Chester, Knight and Barronet, Clerk to His Majesties Council, Registers and Rolls." This work was printed at Edinburgh in 1661 by Evan Tyler, His Majesty's printer.

The collection of Acts is of peculiar historical interest, because it embraced all the Parliamentary proceedings consequent upon the restoration of the House of Stuart, commencing with the new oath of allegiance, His Majesty's prerogative, relations with his officers of State, councillors, and judges, the calling and dissolving of Parliaments, the making of laws, the annuity of £40,000 a year granted to the king, etc. That Parliament was adjourned by the following

" ACT OF ADJOURNMENT.

" The King's Majesty Declares this Parliament current, and Adjourns the same to the twelfth day of March next to come, Ordaining all Members of Parliament, Noblemen, Commissioners of Shires and Burghs, and all others having interest, to attend that day and that there be no new Elections

44 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

in Shires or Burghs, except upon the death of any of the present Commissioners.

“A. PRIMROSE, Cls. Reg.”

On December 14, 1661, Sir Archibald was appointed a lord of session under the title of Lord Carington, a Lord of Exchequer, and a member of the Privy Council. He was responsible for several important laws. He was a follower of the party of Middleton and an opponent of Lauderdale; but he was diplomatic enough to oppose the Act of Billeting, which was aimed at Lauderdale, and succeeded in retaining his offices after Middleton's fall from power. Owing, it has been averred, to the influence of the Duchess of Lauderdale, an intrigue in 1678 led to his removal from the office of Lord Clerk Register, in which he was succeeded by Sir Thomas Murray, of Glendrok, a kinsman of the Duchess; but “to stop his mouth and sore against his heart,” Sir Archibald was given the office of Justice-General, from which, however, he received less remuneration. This office was taken from him on October 16, 1678, and on November 27, 1679, he died, and was buried in the church of Dalmeny, in which parish is situated the charming estate of Barnbogle, or Dalmeny, which had been purchased by him from the Earl of Haddington in 1662.

Sir Archibald has been thus described by Bishop

Burnet, who, to quote again the "Dictionary of National Biography," "was a contemporary, though not unprejudiced witness, and has drawn his character with some justice." Bishop Burnet says :

"He was a dexterous man of business. He had always expedients ready at every difficulty. . . . He was always for soft counsels and slow methods, and thought that the chief thing that a great man ought to do was to raise his family and kindred, who naturally stick to him; for he had seen so much of the world that he did not depend much on friends, and so took no care of making any."

Lord Carington married, first, Elizabeth, daughter and co-heiress of Sir James Keith, of Benholm; and secondly, Agnesm, daughter of Sir William Gray, of Pittendrum, and widow of Sir James Dundas, of Newliston. William, his eldest surviving son by his first wife, succeeded to the baronetcy. His youngest son by his first wife, Gilbert Primrose, obtained a commission in the 1st Foot Guards on September 1, 1680, served on the Rhine and in the Low Countries under Marlborough, and ultimately rose to the rank of Major-General. He died in 1731 at the age of seventy-seven.

The only son of Lord Carington by his second wife was the Archibald who became first Earl of Rosebery. This son was born in 1661, and lived to 1723. In his early manhood he spent considerable time in foreign travel, and served

with the Imperial army in Hungary. He was opposed to the policy of James II. in Scotland, and he was summoned before the Privy Council on June 26, 1688, on the charge of "leasing making and sowing discord among the officers of State." Through the intervention of the Duke of Berwick, the process against him was countermanded. After the Revolution he was appointed one of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber to Prince George of Denmark. In 1695 he was chosen to represent the county of Edinburgh in the Scottish Parliament, and, on account of his steady and zealous support of the Government, he was, by patent dated April 1, 1700, created Viscount Rosebery, Lord Primrose and Dalmeny, to him and heirs male of his body; which failing, to the heirs female of his body; which also failing, to the heirs of entail of his lands. He was sworn a Privy Councillor on the accession of Queen Anne, and was created Earl of Rosebery, Viscount of Inverkeithing, and Lord Dalmeny and Primrose in the Scottish peerage by patent dated April 10, 1703. He was one of the Commissioners for the union with England, and, after that work had been successfully accomplished, he was chosen a Scottish representative peer in 1707, 1708, 1710, and 1713. He married Dorothea, only child and heiress of Everingham Cressy, of Birkin, Yorkshire, representative of the ancient families of Cressy, Everingham, Birkin, etc., by whom he had

twelve children, six sons and six daughters. He died in 1723.

There is abundant evidence that the first Earl of Rosebery was a man of considerable literary taste, for in the British Museum to-day there can be seen a catalogue of his books, which were sold by auction in Edinburgh in 1724.

The front page of the catalogue runs :

A
CATALOGUE
OF VALUABLE
BOOKS

Belonging to the late Earl of Rosebery, consisting of Divinity, History, Law, Architecture, Husbandry, Gardening, Travels, etc., with a great many Volumes of curious Pamphlets. To be sold by Way of Auction the 7th day of December 1724, at the House of Mr. William Adams, Printer, over against the General Post Office.

The Auction will begin every Day except Sunday, at 3 of the Clock in the Afternoon, and continue to 6, till all the Books are sold.

The common Rules of Auctions will be observed.

Catalogues are to be had at the Place of Sale, Price 6*d*. which will be discounted to those who buy Books to the value of 20*s*.

The Books may be seen 3 Days before the Beginning of the Auction.

EDINBURGH
Printed in the Year MDCCXXIV.

48 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

There is a written note in front of the bound volume of the catalogue by James Maidment, who writes :

“ This collection of Books belonged to Archibald Primrose, first Earl of Rosebery who married in February 1690 Dorothea, daughter of Everingham Cressy of Birkin in Yorkshire—by whom he had six sons and six daughters. He died on the 20th of October 1723 in the 59th year of his age. This is the only copy of the catalogue of his books I have ever seen.—J. M.”

These books and pamphlets had all been published between about 1526 and 1713. I have been unable to discover why they were sold. Doubtless their distribution has been deeply regretted by every subsequent Earl of Rosebery, and especially by the present holder of the title.

The first Earl was succeeded in the peerage by his eldest son, James, who, on the death in 1741 of his kinsman Hugh, Viscount Primrose, inherited the family estate and baronetage of the elder branch of the Primrose family.

To make the story of the succession complete, it is well to quote from Burke's Peerage as follows :

“ Sir Archibald Primrose had acquired considerable landed property by purchase, particularly the noble barony of Barnbogle and Dalmeny, which he bought in 1662, from John, fourth Earl of

Haddington. He was succeeded at his decease, 1679, by his second son, Sir William Primrose, of Carington, who married Mary, third daughter of Patrick Scott Esq. of Thirlestane, co. Selkirk, and dying in 1687 was succeeded by his eldest surviving son,

“ Sir James, M.P. for the county of Edinburgh in 1703, who was elevated to the peerage, 30 Nov. 1703, as Lord Primrose and Castlefield, and Viscount Primrose, with remainder, in default of his own male heirs, to those of his father, Sir William Primrose. His lordship married Eleanor, youngest daughter of James, 2nd Earl of Loudoun, and dying 1706 was succeeded by his eldest son, Archibald, second viscount, at whose decease unmarried, in June 1716, the honours devolved upon his brother,

“ Hugh, 3rd viscount, a lieut.-col. in the army, engaged for some years in active service upon the Continent. His lordship married (lic. 14 May 1740) Anne, daughter of Peter Drelincourt, Dean of Armagh, but had no issue. He died 8 May 1741, when the peerage is supposed to have expired, being in remainder to the heirs male of the body of Sir William Primrose, 2nd bart., while the baronetcy passed to his lordship's kinsman,

“ James, 2nd Earl of Rosebery, as 6th bart. His lordship married Mary, daughter of the Hon. Lieut. Gen. John Campbell, and sister of John, 4th Duke of Argyll, by whom he had issue

50 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

John, Lord Dalmeny, who died 11 August 1755; 2 Neil, 3rd Earl, and Dorothea, the wife of Sir Adam Inglis, Bart. The only surviving son,

“Neil, 3rd Earl, K.T., born in 1728, succeeded his father 8 May 1756; he married 1st, in 1764 Susan, sister and heir of Sir Randal Ward, Bart., and 2ndly, 1775 Mary, daughter of Sir Francis Vincent, Bart.”

The third Earl of Rosebery, it will thus be seen, bore the same name, Neil, as the present Earl's second son. The fourth Earl, the present peer's grandfather, was born at Dalmeny Castle, Linlithgowshire, on October 14, 1783. His mother was Mary, only daughter of Francis Vincent, of Stoke d'Abernon, Surrey. The fourth Earl was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, and graduated M.A. in 1804. He was in Parliament for the burgh of Helston in 1805 and 1806 and for Cashel in 1806 and 1807. He succeeded to the Earldom on the death of his father, January, 1814, and for several Parliaments he was chosen as a representative peer. Such selection soon ceased to be necessary to give him the right to sit in the House of Lords, for on January 17, 1828, he was created a peer of the United Kingdom by the title of Baron Rosebery, of Rosebery, Midlothian, which is the title by which the present Earl sits in the Lords. The fourth Earl took an active interest as a Liberal in the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832. He had been in 1831 sworn a member of the Privy

Council, and in 1846 was made a Knight of the Order of the Thistle. From 1843 to 1863 he was Lord-Lieutenant of Linlithgowshire. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society and of other learned institutions. In 1849 he received the honorary degree of D.C.L. from the University of Cambridge.

The fourth Earl married, first, Harriet, second daughter of the Hon. Bartholomew Bouverie (afterwards Earl of Radnor), by whom he had two sons and a daughter. The marriage was dissolved in 1815, and he married a second wife, Anne Margaret Anson, eldest daughter of Thomas, first Viscount Anson (afterwards Earl of Lichfield), by whom he had two sons. His eldest son by the first marriage, Archibald, Lord Dalmeny, born in 1809, represented the Stirling Burghs in Parliament from 1833 to 1847, and from April, 1835, to August, 1841, was a Lord of the Admiralty. This peer's career has been described in the previous chapter.

In numerous brief sketches of the life of the Earl of Rosebery, reference has been made to a striking leading article which on the day of his birth appeared in *The Times*. It related to the condition of the poor and to the housing question, to which the future Prime Minister was later to give his serious attention, and, as Chairman of the London County Council, to contribute valuable work. To indicate the condition of London then it will be useful to quote from the picture which

was drawn in *The Times*. The writer of the article said :

“ And the majority [of the population] is very poor. The poor cannot afford to repair, decorate, and excavate. What they have given them, that they must keep. What they can't mend, that they must endure. This is their condition in many things, but in nothing so much as in their tenements. They may change from one to the other, but they seldom change for the better. They may leave a ruin that is in danger of falling, but it is ten to one that they will find themselves under a roof that admits the rain, or, if they fly from one that lets in water above, they may become tenants of an abode that has no water at all ; or, if they get a supply of water, it is probably tainted with the miasma of a myriad of contiguous and contagious cesspools. Lastly, wherever they go, they are studiously and universally forbidden that freest of God's gifts to man—fresh air. This applies to all large towns indiscriminately ; to all our cities, and especially to London. Women have been known to walk five miles, from one end of the metropolis to the other, to the daily task of charing, and the same distance back again home. . . .

“ And for all these discomforts who is responsible ? The Government ? No. In England such things are above the reach of Government. The landlord ? Alas ! he has nothing to do with the water,—that

belongs to a water company; nor with the cesspools,—they are under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of Sewers; nor with the gas,—that's the gas companies' business. But he has to do with those foul, filthy congregations of bricks, mortar, and unseasoned wood, tottering with their native decrepitude, rotten with morbid moisture, reeking with perpetual vapours, and breathing the infection of ineradicable disease? No, not exactly that, either: he has, to be sure, a little interest in them cottages; he and another gent, a retired bricklayer and a licensed victualler, took a short lease of some ground thereabouts that was rather swampy and didn't cost much. It was just after the time of the Reform Bill, and votes was wanted, so they just run up these little houses amongst them, share and share alike between 'em,—and if one of 'em don't interfere, why, then, neither of the others will. So they stand just as they were built; and if they are not very good, they are not worse than many others, and they are very cheap, all things considered.

"So there they stand, not worse than many others, but, like many others, damp, dark, airless, cheerless, comfortless, where naught that lives lives in health, and death often comes premature to thwart the triumph of the lingering pestilence. Such are the abodes which, with their unsightly cumbrousness, make strangers stare equally at the freedom of English taste and the powerlessness

of the English Government, but of which the exterior deformity feebly indicates the pest and putrefaction within.

“We have spoken of other of our provincial manufacturing towns. Bad, indeed, are the sites, and worse the buildings, of the poorer class. The Hunslet district of Leeds—the Irish quarter of Liverpool—what can be worse than these? We speak of ordinary times and average suffering. This year: Liverpool is groaning under an immigrant disease and an alien famine. But we can assure the world that, bad, wretched, and pitiable as are these places, they do not exceed in misery, wretchedness, and squalor some of the outlying parishes and some of the most central parts of the metropolis. Thread the passages of Whitechapel, dive into the alleys that tessellate Saffron Hill, or descend into that moral Pandemonium which is reached within five minutes’ walk of Westminster Abbey, and you will find such an absence of all the essentials not only of comfort, but almost of civilisation—such destitution, dirt, and squalor as would hardly be tolerated in the by-streets of Toledo or the Trastevere.”

To give point to his assertions, the writer of the article quotes freely from a speech delivered by Lord Ethrington at the Mechanics’ Institute at Plymouth in the year 1845:

“I will now give you an account of a visit I paid, in company with my benevolent friend,

Mr. Toynbee, to a number of dwellings in the neighbourhood of Golden Square, close behind the magnificent thoroughfare of Regent Street. It is a quarter inhabited by the most respectable of the labouring classes. Suffering, but not yet degraded, they received us with courtesy. . . . These families have for the most part but one room, about twelve feet square, in which they sleep and live, and some carry on their trade besides.

“ I found many of them full of steam from clothes hung up to dry across the room. In one there lay a child, dead five days. We did not see one healthy face, either of adult or child. Many children were ill : some had measles, some with fever, many with scrofula which had covered them with wounds. In every family we heard of sickness and death ; some had lost two-thirds, hardly any less than one-half, their children.

“ These houses were now partitioned off into lodgings, at rent varying from sixpence a week for a very bad cellar to five shillings for a large upper room, the average being about half a crown. In no case had they any but an intermittent supply of water at the bottom of the house, which in some cases was kept in water-butts of decaying wood. We never found more than one privy to each house, each containing thirty or forty inmates ; this was sometimes in the centre of the house, sometimes in a little hole of a backyard.

“ Some of these rooms were situated over

crowded cow-houses, where cows, diseased by the badness of the air, supply the neighbourhood with diseased milk; some close to slaughter-houses, where I saw the steam reeking up from hot carcasses; some over cesspools, cleaned out—some once in five, others once in seventeen years. The walls were filthy, the smells either abominable or exchanged for a closeness still more oppressive, the passages dark and tortuous. And yet here were living the most respectable of the labouring classes, porters, policemen, and such-like . . . paying for their one miserable room as much as Mr. Ashworth, of Egerton, a manufacturer such as this country may well be proud of, receives from his prosperous workpeople for cottages which I saw containing five and six and seven rooms each, with every convenience. . . . Hundreds and thousands of human beings annually are born into the richest of earthly capitals to thieve, starve, or rot; and for a Government to interfere for the amelioration of their physical or moral state would be deemed an invasion of popular privileges, vested rights, and private property."

From the time that article was written to the present day is just over half a century. There is a striking likeness in the statements which have recently been placed before the public on the housing problem to the picture here presented of the condition of the poor at the time Lord Rosebery was born. Have we progressed since? There is no

doubt that we have—with the work of the London County Council in clearing insanitary areas, in erecting workmen's dwellings, in the "poor men's hotels" which philanthropists and others have built. Lord Rosebery, by his words and by his acts (especially in connection with the London County Council) has taken an important part in such improvement as we have happily seen. It may well be that in these social problems he may find a suitable field in the future, with all the power and influence once more of the first Minister in the country, for much of his brilliant ability.

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOLBOY—AT BRIGHTON—FAGGING AT ETON—POACHING EGGS
FOR MR. ACLAND—A DEFENCE OF THE SYSTEM OF FAGGING—
SPEAKING AT THE ETON SOCIETY—HIS SCHOOLMASTER'S APPRECIATION—MR. CORY'S LETTERS—"ANYHOW, HE WILL BE AN ORATOR"
—"SUCH A MAN AS THE POETS DELIGHT IN"—"FLOREAT ETONA"

AS Lord Dalmeny the earliest school experience of the present Earl of Rosebery was at Brighton, at the establishment of Mr. W. R. Lee, who well cared for the youngsters in their preparatory period. Eton College was to be the next scholastic home of the young Lord; but before he made his acquaintance with that institution he had delivered his first speech. The then aged Earl of Rosebery, grandsire of the present Peer, took special delight in having the young heir near him, and on one of these occasions there was a volunteer review. The date was September 5, 1861. Lord Dalmeny was enjoying a holiday from school, and was staying at Dalmeny. The Earl of Rosebery had invited the Linlithgow Company of Rifle Volunteers to visit Dalmeny Park.

The volunteers mustered at Linlithgow shortly after eight o'clock in the morning, and proceeded to Winchburgh, from which place they marched

six miles to Dalmeny, where they executed a number of manœuvres. Afterwards they marched to Barnbogle Castle, where they were given a luncheon of a most substantial and sumptuous description. The Earl of Rosebery, K.G., Lord-Lieutenant of the county, presided, and Captain the Hon. Bouverie Primrose occupied the "croupier's," or vice-chairman's, seat. Others present included the Countess of Rosebery, Lady Emily Primrose, Mr. Johnston Stewart, of Straiton, captain of the volunteer company, Captain New, Lord Dalmeny, and James Dundas, of Dundas, Vice-Lieutenant of the county.

After the luncheon, Captain New proposed the health of Lord Rosebery, who in reply frankly stated that he did not consider himself a capable judge of military matters; but on the authority of those on the ground who were able to judge, he had much pleasure in complimenting the men upon their smart and soldier-like appearance and skill in the movements which had been executed. He expressed the fullest sympathy with, and the highest appreciation of, the volunteer movement, and gave it as his opinion that whatever might be the state of parties abroad, or the feeling of foreign nations, the insular position of Great Britain rendered it desirable that the volunteers should maintain themselves in the high proficiency in drill which he had observed with so much pleasure in their evolutions that day.

This address of the aged peer having been listened to with great attention and appreciation, other toasts were given, and the boy-heir had his health drunk with enthusiasm. Being called upon to reply, the future Premier, then only fourteen years old, without hesitation rose, and, with a modesty and clearness of speech which greatly impressed those who listened, expressed his thanks for the honour which had been done him. The brief reports of the proceedings which were published at the time unfortunately do not, so far as the writer's researches have shown, give a record of that first speech; but there is enough related of the interesting gathering to show that the young lord acquitted himself admirably in the few remarks he made.

Eton was soon afterwards entered. To that college Lord Dalmeny was sent in 1862. "Fagging" was then a subject which had been curiously exercising the public mind. Dalmeny of course had to go through the mill, and, like a sensible boy, did not mind it. He was "fag" to Mr. Acland, who was afterwards to be closely associated with him in the political world. Speaking a good many years afterwards at a political meeting, Lord Rosebery recalled the fact, and said :

"It is a long time since you and I, Mr. Chairman [Mr. Acland was presiding over the meeting], first met. I have always been a little under your presidency, because I began as your fag at Eton,

and I little thought when I poached your eggs and made your tea that we were destined to meet under these very dissimilar circumstances. May I allude to one other remark that you made? You said you were now an outsider. Allow me to say, sir, in all that humility which befits our former relations, that I trust you will soon be an insider."

While there may be differences of opinion on the subject of "fagging" generally, the boys themselves, who experience the system, should certainly be listened to on the matter with particular attention. Turning to *The Eton College Chronicle* of Dalmeny's time, there is to be found a very interesting article showing how the lads regarded the question :

"The public schools of England and their management had shared," it was pointed out, "a large portion of attention of late, and every institution and custom observed in them had been criticised. The system of fagging at Eton had been the subject of much conversation in many circles.

"The word 'fagging,' in the abstract, does no doubt sound very harsh and disagreeable, and, like slavery, seems at first sight to be an institution unworthy of Englishmen; and so especially of those who are born out of its noblest families. But both fagging and slavery have changed much during late years, and the more gentle influences of civilisation have extended even to those remote regions where that detestable commerce in mankind is carried on.

“The fact is, that in the great schools of this age there must be some distinction made between those who are strong in body and those whose strength lies in their classical proficiency. This and every other usage has its abuses, and there are, of course, some few instances when this authority has been misapplied. But bullying is now in public schools, at all events in this school, unknown, and the suppression of bullying was brought about by the introduction of fagging.

“The tender mother may have sad misgivings about subjecting her pet child to the austere commands of a rough ‘fifth form,’ and the delicately nurtured offspring of some noble family may think it beneath him to soil his hands by preparing tea and toast for one, if not his equal, very probably his inferior by descent; but both the one and the other may rest assured that in this easy yoke is their chief and only safeguard against the tyranny of youthful despots, who would lay down the law of might against that of right, and who—‘the little tyrant of these fields’—require the supervision of their more learned contemporaries in order to restrain undue violence.

“Unless there be some recognised authority and influence awarded to those who by their abilities or industry have gained a high position in their school, the ‘fifth-form boy,’ who by his hard work or natural talent had climbed up to the top of the tree, but was small in stature

or weak in body, would be at the mercy of any powerful or lazy young reprobate who wished to get his verses done for him, and who would thrash his weaker but more learned playmate in the event of his refusing to comply with his request ; so that those who were the most powerful in body and perhaps the most deficient in knowledge would be the tyrants of their school and the bullies of those who were really their superiors.

“ Therefore the system of fagging is the only antidote to that of bullying. The race must not be to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, but due honour must be paid to whom it is due, and ‘tribute to whom tribute’ ; and this institution, while it acts as an additional incentive to the industrious, is an infallible bridle to the strong, but unlearned, and the necessary protection of Real Merit and Proper Discipline.”

All which is a sufficiently good defence of a system which has done little or no harm and an enormous amount of good.

A perusal of *The Eton College Chronicle* shows how great was the interest taken in sport in the early sixties. The pages are almost entirely devoted to records of sport. The proceedings of the Debating Society were recorded only in lines. Dalmeny joined the Eton Society in 1864, and in the following year, on July 20, the record of the Society’s proceedings thus stands in *The Eton College Chronicle* :

64 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

"Discussion: 'Was Sir Harry Vane's an Estimable Character?' Opened by Lord Dalmeny in his favour. Noes, 16. Ayes, 3. Majority against, 13."

Such brevities were evidently regarded by the conductors of the *Chronicle* as sufficient for these debates, in which many future men of eminence made their earliest marks as orators. All sport, on the other hand, was fully dealt with in its columns, and Dalmeny's name frequently appears in the aquatic notes, for he was particularly fond of boating. Horse-racing had a great interest at the college, and the same number which records Lord Dalmeny's address to the Eton Society devotes a two-column special article to this subject.

Lord Dalmeny was at Eton amongst a number of men who have since made their names notable. He entered the college in 1862, and his contemporaries included Mr. Arthur Balfour and Lord Randolph Churchill, who were his juniors. Mr. Balfour was one year and Lord Randolph two years younger than Dalmeny. Amongst others whose Eton life was contemporary with his were Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Canon H. S. Holland, Lord Esher, Sir Stafford Northcote, the Earl of Pembroke, Bishop Kennion, Lord Halifax, and Lord Minto.

Lord Dalmeny had the advantage at Eton of being influenced very considerably by Mr. William Johnson, who subsequently changed his name to

Cory, by which I shall refer to him. This gentleman was a writer of considerable ability. He was a brilliant scholar and a keen observer. It is impossible to read the "Letters and Journals of William Cory," which were selected and arranged by Mr. Francis Warre Cornish, and printed at Oxford for subscribers only, without being convinced that it must have been good to have been brought into intimate acquaintanceship with that cultured and kindly character. The list of subscribers to Cory's letters and journals is only twenty-three, but it is a distinguished list. It includes Lord Rosebery, Scott-Holland (or H. S. Holland, as it is now the custom to see him styled), Sir S. Northcote, H. O. Sturgis, A. C. Ainger, E. C. Austin Leigh, A. C. Benson, Hon. R. B. Brett, A. D. Coleridge, Capt. H. H. Drummond, Archdeacon Furse, Sir F. Pollock, W. Durnford, Charles Wood (Viscount Halifax), Col. H. Hallam Parr, F. C. Hodgson, H. E. Luxmore, Hon. E. W. S. Lyttelton, Lord Pembroke, F. H. Rawlins, C. D. Williamson, the Hon. F. L. Wood, and E. E. Vaughan. The readers of the letters and journals must feel it to have been a great privilege to have been permitted to subscribe for the volume. With many of the subscribers Mr. Cory had kept up a correspondence, and letters appear addressed to others of note—Mr. H. W. Paul and Mr. C. Kegan Paul, for instance; Lady Pollock, Mr.

F. Warre Cornish, Miss Margaret Cornish, the Rev. E. D. Stone, Mrs. Rose Paul, Miss Gwendolen Graham, and Miss Janet Bartrum.

For so young a lad, Lord Dalmeny, at the time he went to Eton and met this master, William Cory, must have had a marvellous appetite for literature. The first mention of Dalmeny in the Cory correspondence is in a letter dated Eton College, February 9, 1862, and addressed to Mr. Henry Bradshaw. In that letter Mr. Cory shows how his interest had already been aroused in his new pupil. He suggests to Bradshaw that he should come to Eton, as "you will have a new motive if they let you see Hawtrey's books, which will, I suppose, be sold. But come, anyhow, to see the boys and young men. My friend Dalmeny is looking forward to making your acquaintance, with the natural eagerness of a budding bibliomaniac. I took him last week to Lilly's, and he forthwith inquired for rare tracts printed by his ancestor, Primrose. We went on to Evans's, and there he picked out a print representing another Primrose of the seventeenth century, preacher to the French Church in London. At Holloway's he bought autographs, and finally went and made acquaintance with my brother and sister, and showed as much interest in a live child as in dead books. He was quite taken, as I was too, with Dufferin's show speech (do you remember Dufferin?—how Cookesley called him

the 'orator' ?); and when Wayte set theme out of it, the boy put the peroration about 'Laboramas' into flowing, simple, dignified Latin, and then went with me through the last book of the *Princess*. The night before I had translated to him most of the beautiful bits of Agamemnon, and I assure you he enjoyed the old poetry nearly as much as the modern. I am doing all I can to make him a scholar; anyhow, he will be an orator, and, if not a poet, such a man as poets delight in."

It is almost impossible to conceive a more beautiful picture than that of a future Prime Minister at the age of sixteen; a picture of a lad who has already won by his good qualities and exceptional abilities not only the interest and esteem of this cultured and dignified master, but his *friendship*, his admiration for skill in Latin verse, his appreciation as an admirer of the old poetry: "I am doing all I can to make him a scholar; anyhow, he will be an orator, and, if not a poet, such a man as poets delight in." There is no one who has heard a number of addresses in later life by the Earl of Rosebery who can fail to understand how completely has been justified that forecast by William Cory of the future career and qualities of that distinguished pupil.

In a letter written from King's College on April 20 of the same year there was a dissertation upon the subject of Lord Stanhope's "Life of Pitt,"

which in the opening sentence indicates how great was the interest already taken in the life of the statesman with whose career the Earl of Rosebery was subsequently to deal in a biographical sketch. Mr. Cory writes :

“ I have been qualifying for an interview with *you* by reading the ‘ Family Life of Pitt,’ which I find savours not nearly so much of the family as of the Annual Register, being stuffed with narratives of events which Pitt expressed no opinion upon—such as the battle of Camperdown.

“ I find the third volume much better than the two first. There is really much valuable light thrown on Pitt’s resignation. It is a successful book in raising one’s already high estimate of Pitt’s character, but it is not at all an instructive book for a politician ; *e.g.*, the Budgets are treated in a startlingly superficial way. The author should at least have given us the benefit of a striking history of Pitt’s financial policy, given in a Budget speech by Gladstone in 1853. . . .

“ The biography ought to explain, I think, why and how Pitt was estranged from Shelburne, who was, at starting, his leader. I believe Shelburne must have been a really bad man ; but the silence about him after the break-up of his Ministry puzzles me in all books, since he remained for twenty years a leading speaker. . . .

“ On the whole the book is [more] like a shambling and scanty history of England, with

an occasional insertion of something about Pitt, than a political biography."

That letter possesses very considerable interest, remembering that it is written by the Eton master to his pupil. It shows the keenness of the interest which the boy was taking in Pitt, and especially the close study he must have made of his subject, for the master writes: "I have been qualifying for an interview with *you* [the italics are Mr. Cory's] by reading the 'Family Life of Pitt.'" Certain it is that, when the time came for Lord Rosebery to give expression to his own views on the career of a statesman in whom he evinced a peculiar interest, he devoted much consideration to explaining the estrangement between Pitt and Shelburne, and made it a true political biography instead of a scrap of history.

Again and again there are indications of the schoolboy's special interest in Pitt.

The schoolmaster, writing from Penzance, describes the gallery at Boconnoc:

"One end of it is a small, pleasant bookroom, containing one or two morocco relics of the first and last Lord Greville, amongst others a copy given by him to his nephew, Lord Fortescue (my courteous host), and the little book which he edited, 'Chatham's Letters to his Nephew,' with the letter of dedication to William Pitt, beginning so coldly, 'My dear sir,' after they had been so closely and dearly united in their

sweet youth. Pitt never answered the letter, which must have been meant, in Addington's days, as an olive branch."

There are also in this letter some descriptions of the scenery (which would not have been written unless with the knowledge that the pupil would be interested), concluding with a contrast of a piece of broken land with the long troughs of woodland "where the deer and the streamlets wander. It is the most shady, soft, silent, dreamy, poetical spot I ever saw; and I like to connect my beloved eighteenth century—the first age since the time of Pliny when men were at leisure to worship virtue—with so much truly natural beauty and repose."

For some time in the latter portion of 1862 the master was forced to remain away from Eton for a time through illness, and during that period his work was done by his colleagues. Writing on November 17 to Mr. F. Warre Cornish, he says:

"Did you ever read in Keble's 'Lyra Innocentium' the poem on shyness? It should be in every teacher's notebook. . . .

"I have sent these lads some modern history questions, and Dalmeny promises to do them, that he may thereby induce me to come back—rather a circuitous reason. I would give you a piece of plate if you would get that lad to work: he is one of those who like the palm without the dust. He writes me word that he got 'fair' for his 'Lyrics,'"

From Torquay shortly afterwards came a letter to Dalmeny:

"I wish you to read, though it is not much of a book, Bourne's 'Life of Sir Philip Sidney.' Bourne has learnt to admire virtue and liberty for writers better than himself, and he writes in much the same strain as Motley. The really delightful part of Sir Philip Sidney's life is his passionate yet intellectual defence of his injured father, rewarded by the father's perfect admiration. Of all human happiness, the crown is, to be able to defend one's father, or to thank a son for his championship."

Lord Rosebery has given many evidences of the fact that he is a Brontë enthusiast, and certain it is that his schoolmaster helped to develop that taste. Writing to his pupil on November 8, 1863, Mr. Cory says:

"Mrs. Gaskell promised my brother a set of her books, and gave him half a letter, with the signature of C. Brontë. Her writing is not good enough for the author of 'Villette': she turns her *d* over, but she writes a good *s*, which I mean to take up (a Greek *s*), and she makes *a* in the Greek manner (*α*), or something like it. . . .

"I brought away from Staines as my own a delightful Kentish dog called Bob. To-day Bob went out to walk with me, and behaved charmingly. I tied him up in a *pro formâ* way, and left him when I went to chapel. After chapel he was

gone . . . I suspect he has run back to Staines, where he lately tasted blood, the blood of a respectable parishioner, so that he cannot live there, and must be sent back.

* * * * *

“Hartopp is very proud of having fought at the Election riot. He says he knocked down a man; and we believe the man was more like a wineskin than a man, and yielded to a push. Behind the curtain on the landing, two hours after the fray, I heard Rawlins and Lewis, K.S., ask E. Neville Lyttelton about his adventures. Twice did he answer, ‘I got a tap on the head,’ and then they went into the depths of Plato and Livy. . . . My belief is that he knocked down three fellow-creatures, and hurt his knuckles and got some sort of eye. Willan had two black eyes, Turnor one; Candy, at the peril of his life, rescued four captured hats; but still some people came down hatless, as I learn from Hartopp’s theme. . . .”

From the election fight the schoolmaster passes on to one of the earliest references to politics in this correspondence. Mr. Cory writes to Dalmeny:

“I was greatly stirred by the Emperor’s speech, and read it out at construing, with trimmings—that is to say, a quotation from ‘Locksley Hall.’ He is not the worse statesman for indulging an ‘ideologue’s’ taste for visions such as young poets and undergraduates generally take up with, about

‘a Parliament of man, a Federation of the world.’
I like him better than his uncle ; but I would pay
income tax to put an Orleans King in his place
or in his son’s place.”

On November 28, 1863, Dalmeny was written
to thus :

“On Sunday I read from my new book (a
lovely bit of binding) a beautiful old poem which
you ought to know, Tickell’s ‘Elegy on Addison,’
all about Westminster Abbey, where I am to
be next Sunday morning. What can be better
than the combination of classical heroic lines with
the memory of classical, liberal, wise Addison—
mention made of statesmen and poets, in a setting
of perfect ecclesiastical associations?”

Lord Dalmeny’s acquaintance with French was
evidently exceptional. In Mr. Cory’s journal at
Eton on February 2 it is noted, amongst a mass
of things that show how busy a life the school-
master led :

“I looked over Dalmeny’s verses : to alter them
was a long, delicate job, as they were not common-
place *pro formâ* things, but an honest attempt at
turning (of his own accord) some rhymes of mine
which he had read in manuscript on the French
lady who, on her deathbed, made her page play
on the lute ‘La Défaite des Suisses,’ till he came to
‘Tout est perdu,’ then made him go over it again,
and died murmuring those last sad words. . . .

“Feb. 4.—F. Wood came to play chess with

Northcote. . . . Looked over some French exercises with the boys. Incidentally, boys like F. Wood and Dalmeny learn a little by hearing me talk over their mistakes: I appeal to them when in doubt, but I am getting to trust myself more than I did at first."

Dalmeny, in the year 1864, when he was sixteen years of age, visited Italy under the excellent care of Mr. Cory, who sent home some interesting letters describing their doings. Thus he writes to the Rev. C. W. Furse:

"That morning [April 4, 1864] I sent the boys to see the old woman at the Minerva, and they were mightily pleased with him (?) and the other nondescripts.

"I strolled out promiscuously, hit upon the Pantheon, and knew it by sight; saw a church with fleur de lys on it, and found it was dedicated to St. Louis of France, which was rather gratifying. . . .

"Out again with Dalmeny. . . . He wanted to see St. Peter's and St. John Lateran; so we did both, and made a vain attempt at the Sistine. At the Lateran we were happy, reading the inscriptions on the monuments. . . . We had a royal view of the beautiful hills.

"Then we walked back by Coliseum, stumbled upon Cloaca Maxima, with which I was charmed and the boy disgusted; we agreed, however, about the two bell-towers, St. George, I think, and Mouth of Truth, and I enjoyed them all the

more because I had never heard of them. Indeed, I think the second is the prettiest thing in Rome, and well worth imitation as a church tower. So I took the lad to Keats' grave, as we had nothing else to do, and I suppose I am the only man that ever went there twice in one day.

"Negatively I enjoyed my escape from the babble about art. — tried it on with me, but I at once indicated a preference for Paris, and in other ways showed myself Vandal enough to be left to invincible ignorance. He was so good as to suggest that I should devote the morning to Overbeck's studio. . . . All the artists of this century are dust compared to the creeper that hung like a child's uncombed hair over a white garden wall near the Lateran, a handful of the largesse scattered by spring.

"April 5 we went to Cività Vecchia, and took diligence for Pollonica. This was an austere journey, all the length of the Maremma—coming down with a scream to a dark river (Ombrone), and waiting on the bank for a ferryboat coming to us silently with a Cyclops light. One village every five hours. Ninety-four miles of wilderness without rails. . . . That day we had the loveliest sunset at Leghorn; in the street at night we saw the awful and deeply interesting sight of the *Misericordia*, the black-calicoed masked men, with one great torch, tramping fiercely down the street, and stopping at a gin-palace for the coffin. . . . If

anything could add to the terrors of death it would be that mass of live blackness. . . .

"We saw Sainte Chapelle and Notre Dame. . . . We saw the tomb of Napoleon, which is a poor concern; we went to a review of three thousand cavalry, which was beautiful; we heard some fresh, brilliant music, Gounod's *Mireille*; we stopped, we talked politics and history. Dalmeny is a strong but wise admirer of both Napoleons. Altogether he must be the wisest boy that ever lived—and full of fun, too."

On April 19, 1867, when Lord Dalmeny was again in Italy for a tour, Mr. Cory, however, then being at home, there is a letter to Lord Rosebery announcing that he is going to the wild moors near Jane Eyre's country, and that he is reading Burton's "History of Scotland" out of sheer love of the country. He adds:

"If there is one thing I should like to do, it would be to go with some one like-minded, some one who Waverleyed and Marmioned at eight years old, all over Scott's haunts, particularly the Douglas-land which he visited at the very end of his beautiful life, after writing 'Castle Dangerous.'

"Read all you can about St. Francis; go to Assisi. Tell the Italians, with my love, that I have subscribed fifty francs to Manni's monument. Insult Antonelli for me."

The letter is, as usual, signed,

"Yours affectionately."

There is a considerable interval next in the correspondence, there being simply an occasional letter, in one of which Mr. Cory describes an amusing hunting-experience. In 1870 there was a proposal for a water-party to Marlow. The letter was written to the old pupil, now Earl of Rosebery, from 2, High Street, Eton, on June 20, and runs :

“Your suggestion does you credit, and I have forwarded your note to the hero of the day. . . .

“The day must be, I think, John Bap., next Friday ; and I will leave Wise’s Yard in the good old style at 12 o’clock for a Parslovienn¹ of the most orthodox character. I burn my Rubicon’s cross, my scabbard, and throw away my bridge at once by writing to order ducks and pie, etc.

“If you don’t come I shall expect a telegram, and I shall fill up with boy flesh lacking your soul of wit and mirth probably ; but there are some festive lads still here, and some that like ducks, and one or two that like me ; so that I can fill up gaps, but I must have a few hours to do it. . . .

‘Make an effort. You can go to a ball after it, but don’t ask me to let you ‘catch a train’ in time for dinner—that is pure slavery, having to run to catch a train ; and it is that which sets one against asking Londoners to come. Those who

¹ A name for a water-party to Marlow and dinner at the Angler’s Rest, which was then kept by hospitable Mrs. Parslow.

come should be altogether boys in their ways that day; tractable as well as merry, strictly obedient to discipline, tender of the Parslovian roses, etc., etc. I expect you. . . ."

And the affectionate master was not disappointed.

On Lord Rosebery joining the Cabinet in 1885 his old master wrote to him, dating the letter February 12 :

"I wish you joy of being in the Cabinet. . . .

"Mr. Gladstone ought never to have been Prime Minister, because he is so invincibly ignorant of British duties and interests outside Britain. But he has not deserved to fall because Khartoum has fallen; and the cry about disaster is unreasonable.

"This is all that I inflict on you, except a kind wish that you may escape flatterers and toadies, Scottish, Colonial, or others, and will never forget that great example of political dignity, Mr. Pitt. . . . Farewell. Rule Britannia!"

Of the very few letters that were subsequently written, the following shows the keen interest the young lord took in Scottish matters. The letter was written to Miss Urith Collman. It ran :

"My old pupil, Rosebery, used to think, with me, that Cockburn had the finest Scottish mind ever known—he loved Scotland wisely and was content with it. I remember that he noticed with joy and pride the wonderful improvement of Aberdeenshire effected in his own lifetime, the

sterility overcome by mind and by law guiding and guarding industry."

Lord Rosebery in 1898 presided over a unique gathering of Etonians; and as "Floreat Etona" was the whole spirit of the gathering, a description of it may here be introduced. The banquet was given in the Café Monico, by old Etonians, to three distinguished *confrères*, in celebration of their appointment to high places—the guests being Baron Curzon, of Kedleston, who was shortly going to India as Viceroy; the Earl of Minto, called to the Governor-Generalship of Canada; and the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, then Bishop-Designate of the Metropolitan See of Calcutta. Their hosts were a most distinguished band, two hundred and thirty in number. They had been organised by a committee consisting of the Marquis of Lansdowne, Mr. St. John Brodrick, M.P., Mr. A. Lyttelton, M.P., Mr. Walter Durnford, and Mr. Gerald Loder, M.P. Even the decoration of the tables was remarkable. It was a harmony in blue and white, the latter colour displayed by an amazing number of baskets of chrysanthemums; the blue, which, as Etonians and their friends know well, is the colour of the college, appearing in silk bows on the flowers, in a river of silk gauze running down each table, and in the shades of the candles with which every good restaurant-keeper thinks it necessary to poison the air, in spite of the electric light. On the back

of the dinner-card was a list illustrating the success of Etonians in rising to great posts. It showed that of fifteen Governor-Generals of Canada, eight, including the Earl of Minto, were trained at Eton, and of sixteen Viceroys of India, nine, counting Lord Curzon, had the same advantage.

Lord Rosebery, asking his hearers to drink to the Queen, said it was recorded of one of Her Majesty's predecessors that he remarked at an Eton festival that Etonians were always to remember that he was an anti-Westminster. Those small polemics had disappeared. Our present Sovereign took a larger view of her relation to her subjects, not excluding those of Westminster. But Etonians liked to think that her residence near Eton gave her a practical interest in their *alma mater*.

Lord Rosebery next proposed the toast of the evening. This, he said, was in some respects the most remarkable dinner at which he had had the honour of assisting. A pair of smoked glasses almost seemed necessary to contemplate the dazzling celebrities who owed their success to Eton and were assembled here. He well knew that on an occasion like this the duty of a chairman was to obliterate himself. He remembered a story that the late Lord Granville used to tell. His lordship was a guest at a dinner to a governor-designate with very indifferent powers of speaking. As the guest laboured through his speech, Lord Granville

cast his eye on the orator's notes and saw marked in red ink and underlined, "Here dilate on the cotton trade." Lord Rosebery forgot the end of the story, but considering Lord Granville's readiness of resource, it was not difficult to surmise that those notes disappeared, and the orator soon followed their example. He (Lord Rosebery) would not be guilty, and he trusted that the numerous Viceroys that bristled around him would not be guilty, of anything like dilation on the cotton trade. Another reason made it impossible to speak at length on this occasion. Every ship of war was supposed to be the territory of the country to which it belonged, and on the same hypothesis he held that this apartment, which bore all the characteristics of a London coffee-room of the most refined and brilliant kind, was Eton territory. No one who had had experience of the debates in "Pop," or even of the conversation of Etonians, would forget that brevity was the soul of wit. Words such as "rot" and "bosh" were usually applied by Etonians to any one who exceeded three or four minutes in speaking. But if this was Eton territory, one seemed to see through a glass darkly a vision of these viceroys and bishop designate drinking the "long glass" before initiation on the present occasion. There was no "long glass" at hand; otherwise the company would no doubt support the Chairman if he moved that the ceremony should be performed. But the

82 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

associations of this company with Eton were getting somewhat dim and distant. They were represented by the presence of relations in the first, second, or third generation, who were privileged to be pupils within the walls of Eton, and he was not sure that there was not an intensified feeling of gloom when one found among his juniors at Eton a Viceroy of India and a Bishop-Designate of Calcutta going forth in the full maturity of their powers to discharge the important functions of their offices. But all had to drag the lengthening chain, lengthening daily as regarded their connection with Eton. There was one consolation which an Etonian had in growing older—he always retained pride in the prowess of his school. The Chairman had never known but one Etonian who did not like Eton, and he very soon went to the devil. It was a school which with everlasting flow turned out viceroys and bishops and ministers for this Empire of ours. The great Duke of Wellington once said—it was a quotation the company were sure to expect—that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing-fields of Eton; and he did not know how far those fields were to extend, what treeless wastes they were to encompass. But a great deal more than the battle of Waterloo had been won on those fields. What, for instance, would Canada have done without Eton, seeing that of her last six Governor-Generals all but one was an Etonian? Lord Aberdeen was

the unhappy exception, and no doubt if he could he too would have been an Etonian. It was infinitely pathetic that their *alma mater* should turn out almost unconsciously the men who governed the Empire, for however great the learning gained at Eton, the highest and best part of the education obtained there was not the education of the brain, but the education of character. It was character which had made the Empire what it is. One of the distinguished guests on the present occasion (Dr. Welldon) had been head-master of an establishment (Harrow) which perhaps ought not to be named on this occasion, but which was painfully present to their minds about the middle of July. Dr. Welldon, with his Etonian experience, had no doubt moulded Harrow into something more like Eton than it used to be. At any rate, making a great sacrifice, and giving up one of the most envied of English positions, he was going out to take the Bishopric of Calcutta under circumstances which must commend him to all Etonians. He was going to fill the See of Heber animated by that noble hymn which Heber wrote, and one result of his stay in India would certainly be that he would impart a new inspiration to Indian Christianity. Then there was his (the Chairman's) old colleague and contemporary, Lord Minto—better known to some by the name of Rowley. There raged in the Chairman's mind a controversy which had never ceased to rage in it since he

was thirteen years old—namely, which had the greatest share in the government of the Empire, Scotland or Eton? He was quite prepared to give the fighting glory to Ireland, for when we had Wolseley, Kitchener, and Roberts all hailing from Ireland, he feared that Scotland could not compete with her; but when, as in Lord Minto's case, Scotland and Eton were combined, there was a combination so irresistible that human eloquence could hardly describe it. Lord Minto came of a governing family; indeed, at one time it was thought a too-governing family. In former days it was felt that the Elliotts bulked perhaps too large in the administration of the nation. If they did so, it was due to their merits. There had already been a Viceroy Lord Minto. There had been innumerable distinguished members of the family, the most distinguished of all being that Hugh Elliott who defeated Frederick the Great at the very summit of his reputation, and went through every adventure that a diplomatist could experience. The Chairman was quite sure that the present Lord Minto was destined to make an abiding mark. Then there was their other guest (Lord Curzon), who was going to fill the highest post of the three—that of Viceroy of India. It was one of the greatest offices that any human being could occupy. He went to it in the full flower of manhood and success, and everybody must wish him well. Lord Curzon had this additional

advantage, that he was reviving the dormant glories of the Irish peerage. Some persons might think that the fact implied a new legislative or constitutional development on the part of Government, but it would be out of place on the Chairman's part to surmise anything on the subject. At any rate, it was certain that Lord Curzon had shown, in his representation of the Foreign Office, qualities of judgment, of debating power, and of argument which had hardly been surpassed in the career of any young man of his standing. It would not be safe to say that he had done so in defence of difficult positions. That would raise a political controversy of the gravest kind. But foreign situations were always difficult, and where he had had to defend them he had defended with success. He would have great advantages as Viceroy. He had studied India on the spot. He had even entered into amicable relations with neighbouring potentates—and he would pass from his home, Kedleston Hall, Derbyshire, to an exact representation of it in Government House, Calcutta. It was to be hoped that in his time India would enjoy the prosperity of late denied to her, and that immunity from war and famine and pestilence might be the blessed prerogative of Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty. Only one word more. As the First Witch in *Macbeth* said :

When shall we three meet again—
In thunder, lightning, or in rain ?

The guests of this evening might repeat that question. Some, at any rate, of the present company would greet them on their return. They would then, no doubt, have to tell of stewardship honourably undertaken and triumphantly achieved, helping to consolidate the Empire whose interests all had at heart, and adding to the glory of our mother England.

The Earl of Minto remarked that he saw around him so many old Eton faces that he could almost fancy himself back at the old school.

Lord Curzon, of Kedleston, said that gathering of old schoolfellows and old friends, who had inherited the same traditions and were loyal to the same collegiate mother, was a compliment which the happy trio who were fortunate enough to be the guests of the company were never likely to forget. But if there was anything that could enhance the special significance and value of that compliment, it would consist in the fact that Lord Rosebery had consented to occupy the chair. It would ever be memorable to him (Lord Curzon), whose public life had been associated with one political party, that at this turning-point in his fortunes his health had been proposed by one who had been the leader of the rival political party. It would be memorable to all three of the guests that, as they were starting forth for their different spheres of work, the farewell to which they had listened should have proceeded

from the lips of an ex-Prime Minister of England. Surely there was something of good omen in that combination, for after all they were each going out to occupy, if the metaphor might be permitted, a different thwart in that stout craft of Empire of which Lord Rosebery once pulled the stroke-oar. From his lips they had all on many occasions imbibed lessons of an Imperialism exalted but not arrogant, fearless but not rash—Imperialism which was every day becoming less and less the creed of a party, and more and more the faith of the nation.

Dr. Welldon rejoiced at the thought that Eton did, by that gathering, seem to recognise in the Imperial mission of her sons not only the forces of law and civilisation, but something that lay behind those forces, and that something the moral or spiritual element which was the source of all that was best and most sacred in the world.

“Floreat Etona” was proposed by Lord Landsdowne, and responded to by the Provost of Eton.

Lord Roberts, of Candahar, then proposed the health of the Chairman, remarking that he felt grateful to the noble Lord for having broken the silence of two years by those patriotic speeches which had produced a feeling of satisfaction in the whole nation.

Lord Rosebery, in reply, speculated humorously on the reason for the success of Etonians in careers of the State, and ascribed it to the condensation of

obscure error known as the "Eton Description Book." Some learned by imitation, and some by avoidance. "We," he added, "learned by avoidance." By studying the "Eton Description Book" with some attention they discovered what was error and what they must ever repeat as fact. He thought that was a very remarkable and interesting gathering, and should like to propose its annual renewal, but he was going to do nothing of the kind. He thought there was one obstacle to any such renewal. There were such passions as jealousy and envy. Think what it would be if they annually paraded before the world the fame and success of Eton. He went further. In various organs of the Press it might some day be discovered that the Etonians constituted an aristocratic caste which, united by the same bonds, governed the country in the interests of that caste. What would prevent the infuriated mob from falling upon the Etonians, determined to massacre the innocents before they grew up into the criminals of the caste? What would happen if some distinguished foreign observer should come over to study men and things on the spot? He could dictate to them what he would say at that moment. He would say: This has been said to be a limited monarchy. It is nothing of the kind. A despot reigns in the Keep of Windsor Castle, and underneath the shadow of that fastness there is carried on a summary jurisdiction under the superintendence

of the Crown which governs the country—a sort of Jesuitical class devoted to nothing else than selection for that purpose, regardless of their aptitude or talent. That is the way in which the British Empire is conducted. They who loved Eton must not allow insidious error to grow up. Once in ten years was enough to enjoy such a triumph as that. He urged them, if they had at heart the interest of the school, not to tax too much the patience of the community by trying a further renewal of that glorious banquet.

It is needless to add that at this noteworthy function every humorous allusion by Lord Rosebery was thoroughly appreciated by his fellow Etonians, and the banquet was one of the most interesting and successful “school” dinners ever held.

CHAPTER V

UNDERGRADUATE DAYS AT OXFORD—ANTIQUATED CUSTOMS—THE DAYS OF REFORM—DEAN LIDDELL'S IMPROVEMENTS—SOCIAL DISTINCTIONS ABOLISHED—THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPORT—A DIFFICULTY ABOUT HORSES

THE Rev. Henry L. Thompson, in his "Life of Dean Liddell," gives many interesting details about the conditions of Christ Church, Oxford, of which Liddell was appointed Dean in 1855. The Chapter at that time is described as "a heterogeneous body : with none of its members, except Dr. Jacobson, was the new Dean likely to be in warm sympathy. Yet to the Dean and Chapter then belonged the whole government of Christ Church ; the students had absolutely no power or authority. Though the censors and tutors were responsible for the discipline and the tuition of the undergraduates, they were without a voice in all questions relating to the property or the general administration of the House. The Dean and Chapter were the sole governors."

As an illustration of the subordinate position then occupied by the students, it may be mentioned that the High Table or the dais in

the dining-hall, at which the Dean and canons sat twice a year upon the annual "gaudy" days, was habitually occupied, not by the tutors, but by the undergraduate noblemen, or "Tufts," who ranked as doctors, and thus sat daily above their preceptors at their common meal. It was a strange survival from the sixteenth century, and it did not endure much longer.

One great change which the first University Commission had strongly recommended, Dean Liddell witnessed and approved: the abolition of the distinction between noblemen, gentlemen-commoners, and commoners. Whatever must have been the justification in older days, says Mr. Thompson, for the formal recognition of differences of rank among undergraduates, it was by now an anachronism, and did harm, especially when young men were admitted to the enjoyment of peculiar privileges whose intellectual equipment was below the ordinary level, and who were not even nominally employed in reading for a degree.

When gentlemen-commoners appeared at collections, and were examined in Creasy's "Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World" as the staple of their term's work, it was time that "their order should cease to exist within the walls of Christ Church." They had degenerated into an idle clique of wealthy men, enjoying certain immunities, but bringing no corresponding advantage to the college.

Some years before, Osborne Gordon had sent a gentleman-commoner who was devoid of classical tastes to a course of lectures on "The Atmosphere," with a promise to examine him in collections, and find out what he had learnt. "Well, Mr. —," said Gordon, "what is the atmosphere composed of?" After much hesitation the man replied, "Zinc." "Thank you," said Gordon, "that will do. Good-morning." It was considered far better that distinctions which rendered such things possible should vanish, and the reform was effected under the Ordinance of 1867, in which it was enacted that "There should be no distinctions in respect to academical dress, designation, college charges, or college payments among Undergraduate Members of the House not being Junior Students nor Exhibitioners within the House."

Lord Rosebery's sojourn at Christ Church, the college where the Prince of Wales had matriculated seven years previously, was notable, at any rate, for the bringing about by Dean Liddell of newer and better customs. When Lord Rosebery matriculated in January, 1866, the antiquated and injurious table regulations still obtained; but they were to go in the following year, and even the "gaudy" days were ended too.

At Oxford Lord Dalmeny was exceedingly popular. He continued to take the liveliest interest in sport, and also read greatly.



Photo. by Hills & Saunders, Oxford.]

LORD ROSEBERY AS AN OXFORD UNDERGRADUATE.



Oxford men, who are and always have been supposed to know everything, took an interest in a wonderful variety of topics. How comprehensive was the field is well shown in *The Dark Blue*, a magazine which made its appearance in 1867, and had a brief career. In its first issue, in May, it devoted much space to the consideration of "The Present Crisis" everywhere. This was a truly wonderful essay. It covered phases of home and foreign politics, social questions, Indian government, Church questions, the position of Ireland, the condition of trade, party allegiance, the diffusion of the Press, and the advance of secular knowledge.

Having regard to the views of Lord Rosebery's father on the subject of Athletics, it is peculiarly interesting to note how keen was the interest in athletics which was being taken at this time in Oxford. *The Dark Blue* contains much about all kinds of sport, and at this time had an article which said :

"Athletic sports of every description have increased and multiplied with giant strides, until their growth has been pronounced precocious. Those who condemn them as overgrown and abnormal have the calm consolation that a reaction must set in in the complainer's favour ; reactions always do set in, so they have only to abide in patient faith.

"If these aspirations of young England for

muscular excellence, or muscular Christianity (call it which you please), be extravagant, they are also suicidal, and if left to themselves will soon find the 'due mean' and pursue a proper course without exciting any one's bounties. But really we don't see their extravagance. For the last two years, and more especially for the last two terms, there has been a great run upon them, but they have been embraced by men who found in them a most suitable field for the exercise of their ambition as well as of their limbs. . . . And if only on the ground that it promotes and prompts sensible activity, this comparatively new athletic movement should meet with encouragement and approbation.

"And so it does amongst the men themselves; it is only the deeper philosophy of the 'powers that be' which waxes wroth. . . . We conclude, like M. Thiers, and recommend one and all to follow the 'policy of sound common sense,' the certain result of which will be moderation and forbearance. Even dons will tacitly consent to these virtues, learning to let live what they dare not love, and the athletic world will jog along in health and happiness."

This article is followed, too, by special notes about the Derby of the year, the chances of the various horses entered being discussed at considerable length. Many men in the University, Lord Dalmeny amongst the number, were taking a keen interest in horse-racing, and Dalmeny had already determined to win the Derby if he could.

He kept a stud, his horses had several times been successful in steeplechases, and in consequence got into difficulties with the authorities, the Dean disapproving the practice.

This difference led to Lord Dalmeny, who had always a great spirit of independence, deciding to leave Oxford without troubling to take the degree which would have been easily his had it been his pleasure to secure it. To one born to his estate the matter was, however, of so small importance that he preferred to follow his own inclinations entirely, and did so. He left the University to the deep regret of all his contemporaries, who admired his spirit, and regretted the loss of a genial, unaffected, and brilliant colleague. He had at that time already given evidence that his political views, like those of his father and grandfather, were those of an ardent Radical.

CHAPTER VI

DEATH AND FUNERAL OF THE FOURTH EARL—SUCCESSION TO THE
PEERAGE—WORK AND STUDY—THE POLITICAL ARENA—THE
QUEEN OPENS PARLIAMENT—A BRILLIANT SCENE—LORD ROSEBERY'S
FIRST SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS—COMPLIMENTS OF STATES-
MEN AND JOURNALISTS

IN the year following that in which he left Oxford, Lord Dalmeny, by the death of his grandfather, became Earl of Rosebery. The fourth earl died on March 4, 1868, at his London house in Piccadilly, at the great age of eighty-five.

The remains were taken to Dalmeny, where the funeral took place on March 13, the coffin being placed in the family mausoleum at Dalmeny church. There was a great gathering at the ceremony, the whole of the tenants on the estate, the servants, and representatives of societies with which the deceased peer had been connected attending, in addition to the relations and connections.

The body was placed, prior to its removal for interment, in the drawing-room of the mansion; and the company assembled in the library, where they were received by Lord Dalmeny.

In the drawing-room the opening portion of the Church of England Burial Service, usually read in church, was privately gone through, the officiating clergy being the Very Rev. Dean Ramsey and the Rev. G. B. Field, Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Rosebery. The devotions in the library were conducted in an impressive manner by the Rev. Robert Muir, parish minister of Dalmeny. Luncheon was afterwards served in the dining-room ; and the procession started from the mansion about a quarter to two. The *cortège* was headed by the tenants and chief servants of the deceased, numbering over eighty, who walked four abreast, headed by Mr. Glendinning, the respected factor of the estates. Mr. Walker, one of the most respected of the late earl's retired servants, was also present, and received kind attentions from Lord Dalmeny.

The handsome full-draped hearse was drawn by six black horses, with postilions. Fourteen mourning-coaches followed, eight of them drawn by four horses each, and the remainder by two each ; and this long line was further extended by more than twenty private conveyances.

The immediate relatives and connections who followed were Lord Dalmeny (chief mourner), Hon. Everard Primrose, Henry Wyndham, Henry Primrose, Henry Tufnell, Edward Primrose and Gilbert Primrose, and James Dundas, of Dundas Castle, the deceased earl's oldest friend and

neighbour. The mourners included the managers of the Scottish Widows' Fund, of which he had been President.

The procession was awaited in the village of Dalmeny by a considerable crowd, who had gathered near the church. The coffin was borne to the vault by six of the principal servants, and the remaining portion of the Church of England Burial Service was gone through, the tenants and others being afterwards admitted to the vault.

The coffin, of polished oak, with gilt mountings, was ornamented with the coronet and the Star of the Order of the Thistle. The inscription was :

ARCHIBALD JOHN PRIMROSE,

EARL OF ROSEBERY, VISCOUNT ROSEBERY,

VISCOUNT INVERKEITHING, BARON PRIMROSE AND DALMENY

IN THE PEERAGE OF SCOTLAND ;

BARON ROSEBERY OF ROSEBERY

IN THE COUNTY OF EDINBURGH, IN THE PEERAGE

OF THE UNITED KINGDOM ;

BARONET OF NOVA SCOTIA,

KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF THE THISTLE ;

BORN 14 OCT., 1783

DIED 4TH MARCH, 1868.

The sad and imposing ceremony over and the conventional days of mourning passed, the new peer set himself to understand the estates of which he had now become the possessor. His

heart was with the people always, and now he determined to make the acquaintance of the tenants, upon whom he called; and, in fact, at some of the houses—some of the smaller houses, too—he was a frequent and always a heartily welcomed guest. Wherever he went, the young Earl made friends. It is certain, one must think who has met his lordship at all frequently, that he can never have made enemies except in the political world, where a clever man, especially if he succeeds soon, is sure to find them.

Lord Rosebery also at this time, as ever afterwards, took keen delight in his shooting. He thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity his estates gave him for following this branch of sport. He became of age a few weeks after his grandfather's death. He took his seat in the House of Lords, and then came a proceeding which in a remarkable way shows how earnest Lord Rosebery has been in his life-work. He then commenced a period, which was to be greatly prolonged, of hard, steady, and well-directed reading. Moreover, he travelled a great deal, visiting not only the Continent, but crossing the Atlantic. He was studying wherever he went, learning how the people lived, what they thought and desired, how questions which needed treatment in the future were being dealt with in other countries, and how lessons which he learnt from the proceedings of others might be applied to his own country. And he was studying with

exceptional closeness and unceasing application the politics of his own country, and also the history and politics and social conditions of the whole world. He was indeed working for that political career which he had marked out for himself.

And so a few years passed by.

And here again, on the threshold of his political career, as at Eton, we find him speedily attracting the notice of his master—the political master as of the schoolmaster. Mr. Gladstone was early impressed by the young Earl's abilities, and distinction speedily came.

The year 1871 was one of great moment for the young Earl. He made his first speech in the House of Lords at the opening of the Parliamentary Session on Thursday, February 10. The occasion was particularly noteworthy for another reason—the Queen opened Parliament in person. It was the third session of Her Majesty's eighth Parliament; and since the sad day when the Queen lost the Prince Consort she had only met Parliament in person on two occasions—in 1866 and again in 1867, and now was the first time that she had personally welcomed the members of the Reformed Parliament to the commencement of the labours of the session. The Queen's attendance always makes a brilliant scene of what in her absence is a dull and unpicturesque ceremony. One writer, describing the scene in *The Standard*, says :

“ At twelve o'clock admission was granted. The early arrivals were numerous. Ladies in the most elegant and *recherche* of toilettes sat daintily down on those red benches where one is accustomed to see nothing more interesting than middle-aged peers, whose figures and complexions are all the worse for the wear and tear of political life. Instead of black coats and bald heads, there were clusters of beautiful—or at the worst beautifully dressed—women; and there was the rustling of silks and satins and the faint whisper of feminine voices to replace, agreeably enough, the eloquence with which the House of Lords usually resounds. It is the courteous custom of the peers to leave their senatorial chamber almost wholly to the ladies whenever the Queen opens Parliament. The galleries are exclusively theirs, and they also absorb about three-fourths of the seats on the floor of the House. It is a veritable ladies' Parliament for the occasion, and one only regretted that the charming transformation was so essentially temporary in its duration. A few benches were placed behind the clerks' table, whereon peers were allowed to sit, and the front Ministerial and Opposition benches were forbidden to the fair sex. Here and there, too, in odd corners or chance seats, a noble duke or earl might be detected; but for the most part they yielded the positions to their fair friends, and decidedly formed the least important portion of the spectacle.

"It cannot be truthfully alleged that their absence was any loss in a picturesque point of view, for neither the most prepossessing personal appearance nor the most dignified carriage can make a peer look anything but ridiculous in the grotesque scarlet gown, heavily trimmed with ermine, which he is obliged to wear on these occasions. The self-sacrificing disposition shown by their temporal lordships was imitated by the spiritual peers, who gave up all their seats, except the front one, to the ambassadors and the *attachés* of the foreign embassies.

"Among those who were conspicuous were Baron Brunnow and Count Bernstorff; and the gay uniforms and innumerable orders and medals of themselves and their colleagues gave that part of the house an aspect of great brilliancy. By half-past two o'clock the visitors were nearly all seated. Lord Cairns (who was amongst the earliest arrivals), Lord Longford, and others of the leading Conservative peers were in their accustomed places, and fronting them sat the Duke of Argyle, Lord Dufferin, Lord Kimberley, and some of their colleagues. The Bishops of Winchester, London, Peterborough, and Gloucester, and the Archbishop of York occupied the single bench which had been kept for them, the back seats being used by the ambassadors and *attachés*. On the front bench immediately facing them there was the Duke of Cambridge in field-marshal's

uniform under his peer's robes, and looking as if not thoroughly recovered from his recent fit of gout. The spot usually occupied by the woolsack was as yet empty, but just in the rear of it, on a fanteuil, were grouped the judges of England, with flowing wigs and white ermine, somehow reminding an innocent spectator of a group of condemned heretics waiting their *auto da fé*. At the table was Sir Denis le Marchant, in gorgeous official uniform, and Mr. Bethell, whose barrister's robes contrasted oddly with the wealth and diversity of the colours around him. Queer enough was the appearance of the robed peers who sat on the benches behind the clerks' table. Impossible, or at least extremely difficult, it was to recognise familiar forms clothed in that oddest and ugliest of costumes. If those fashionable novelists who insist upon making their aristocratic persons slim and tall and haughty in appearance could only have caught a glimpse of the originals in their official costume, what a wholesome revolution would come over the light literature of the day!

"In the gallery by the throne were some Oriental personages, all in a blaze of gold and silver; and one could not but contrast the picturesqueness and striking brilliancy of their garb with the dowdy official robes in which British peers are expected to disfigure themselves in the presence of their Queen. The ladies, however,

amply made up for the deficiency of their fathers and husbands and brothers. It would require the training of a lifetime and the pen of a man-milliner to do justice to the infinite variety of their toilettes. We can only say, in general terms, that they made the floor of the House of Lords resemble a parterre of brilliant flowers. A more beautiful scene it would not be easy to imagine, and we should not like to speculate upon the degree of enthusiasm it must have excited in the breasts of the distinguished foreigners who witnessed it. We remember once to have read a description of a similar spectacle that was sent by a Frenchman to a French journal. It was full of ecstasy and points of admiration from beginning to end; but when he came to the entrance of the Queen and the simultaneous disappearance of the mantles in which the ladies had up to the time covered themselves, he could do nothing but put a long dash, and leave the scene to the imagination of the reader. We shall presume to adopt the same course when the right moment arrives.

“Meanwhile, it must be recorded that the first of the royal personages to make their appearance were the Princess Teck and Princess Christian, who arrived together. The whole assembly rose at their entrance and made a low salutation, which was graciously returned. The Princesses took their seats on the woosack, facing the House. Shortly afterwards the Prince and Princess of

Wales came in, and were received with the same marks of respect. Her Royal Highness sat on the woolsack, between Princess Teck and Princess Christian, and the Prince was conducted to a chair on the right hand of the throne. He wore the field-marshal's uniform under his peer's robes, and seemed to be in the enjoyment of robust health. The Princesses were in slight mourning, on account, we believe, of the death of Princess Auguste of Coburg.

“At ten minutes past two o'clock the guards of honour, stationed at the entrance to the House, were heard to ‘present arms,’ and in another moment Her Majesty made her appearance, accompanied by the Princesses Louise and Beatrice and the Prince Arthur. Her Majesty was conducted to the throne, and as soon as she was seated she made a gesture for the assembly to do the same. The Princesses Louise and Beatrice remained standing on Her Majesty's left hand. Behind them was Lord Granville, holding the Sword of State. The Earl of Bessborough, with the Crown of England glittering on its velvet cushion, stood on Her Majesty's right hand, and beside him was the Marquis of Winchester, with the cap of maintenance. Prince Arthur stood by the chair on which the Prince of Wales was seated. Her Majesty was dressed in black, and wore a Marie Stuart's widow's cap. She also wore a magnificent necklace of diamonds and the Order of the Garter.

The Sergeant-at-Arms was dispatched for the members of the House of Commons, and in a minute or two were heard the first sounds of that ugly rush with which the representatives of the people persist in precipitating themselves into the presence of their Sovereign. The Speaker, vainly essaying to stem back the tide, found it hard work to maintain his balance, and Mr. Gladstone, objecting to the increasing pressure in the rear, remonstrated in a somewhat vehement manner with his unruly followers."

Describing the rush of the Commons into the Upper House, *The Daily News* said :

"It was now that a faint rumble was heard in the distance, and the bishops, peers, and judges were seen to turn their faces with meek amusement to the end of the chamber opposite to the throne. Then the rumble grew into a roar. Then it seemed as if some wild animal had broken loose, and other wild animals were hunting it. Then the rumble and roaring were succeeded by bellows and the trampling of many feet. Then the Speaker of the House of Commons, in wig and gown, stood at the bar ; and Mr. Gladstone [then Prime Minister] was shot, as if by a catapult, to his side. Then came a turbulent mob of heated, struggling, pushing men, who dug into each other's ribs, and made toes of no account whatever ; and then a door was slammed, and it was understood that no more of the Commons could be admitted. Mr. Gladstone's

earnest and pained face when he turned to protest against being prodded by fists from behind, and the helpless position he was in till the unruly mob behind him had settled into their places, are things to remember; and it is clear that every member of the Lower House wishing to present himself before his Sovereign at the opening of Parliament should first take lessons from a prize-fighter or in the wrestling of Cumberland. . . . There was a striking lack of bald or grey heads among the representatives of the Commons who found their way to the Lords. That was a feat only to be performed by the young and strong, as many a baffled and elderly senator found out that day to his cost."

"The general belief was that the Queen would read the Speech herself; but she did not. Her Majesty, who seemed to suffer some inconvenience from the heat, and used her fan constantly, delegated the duty to her Lord Chancellor; and, seeing what an exceedingly long one her Ministers had provided her with, it is not surprising that she found the task of personally delivering it one beyond her strength. So the Lord Chancellor came forward and said:

"'I am commanded by the Queen to read to you Her Majesty's Speech; therefore, in Her Majesty's name and in Her Majesty's own words, I will now proceed to read it.'"

The Queen's Speech on that occasion will show

the troublous times in which Lord Rosebery made his entrée into the political arena. It ran :

“ MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,—

“ At an epoch of such moment to the future fortunes of Europe, I am especially desirous to avail myself of your counsels.

“ The war which broke out in the month of July, between France and Germany, has raged until within the last few days with unintermitted and likewise with unexampled force ; and its ravages may be renewed after but a few days more, unless moderation and forethought, prevailing over all impediments, shall sway the councils of both the parties whose well-being is so vitally concerned.

“ At the time when you separated I promised a constant attention to the subject of neutral obligations ; and I undertook to use my best endeavours to prevent the enlargement of the area of the war, and to contribute, if opportunity should offer, to the restoration of an early and honourable peace.

“ In accordance with the first of these declarations, I have maintained the rights and strictly discharged the duties of neutrality.

“ The sphere of the war has not been extended beyond the two countries originally engaged.

“ Cherishing with care the cordiality of my relations with each belligerent, I have forborne from whatever might have been construed as gratuitous or unwarranted interference between parties, neither

of whom had shown a readiness to propose terms of accommodation such as to promise of acceptance by the other.

“ I have been enabled, on more than one occasion, to contribute towards placing the representatives of the two contending countries in confidential communication ; but until famine compelled the surrender of Paris, no further result had been obtained.

“ The armistice now being employed for the convocation of an Assembly in France has brought about a pause in the constant accumulation, on both sides, of human suffering, and has rekindled the hope of a complete accommodation.

“ I pray that this suspension may result in a peace compatible, for the two great and brave nations involved, with security and with honour, and likely, therefore, to command the approval of Europe and to give reasonable hopes of a long duration.

“ It has been with concern that I have found myself unable to accredit my Ambassador in a formal manner to the Government of Defence which has subsisted in France since the Revolution of September ; but neither the harmony nor the efficiency of the correspondence of the two States has been in the smallest degree impaired.

“ The King of Prussia has accepted the title of Emperor of Germany at the instance of the chief authorities of the nation.

"I have offered my congratulations on an event which bears testimony to the solidity and independence of Germany, and which I trust may be found conducive to the stability of the European system.

"I have endeavoured in correspondence with other Powers in Europe to uphold the sanctity of treaties and to remove any misapprehension as to the binding character of their obligations.

"It was agreed by the Powers which had been parties to the Treaty of 1856 that a conference should meet in London. This conference has now been for some time engaged in its labours, and I confidently trust that the result of its deliberations will be to uphold both the principles of public right and the general policy of the Treaty, and at the same time, by a revision of some of its conditions in a fair and conciliatory spirit, to exhibit a cordial co-operation among the Powers with regard to the Levant.

"I greatly regret that my earnest efforts have failed to procure the presence at the conference of any representative of France, which was one of the chief parties of the Treaty of 1856, and which must ever be regarded as a principal and indispensable member of the great commonwealth of Europe.

"At different times several questions of importance have arisen, which are not yet adjusted, and which naturally affect the relations between

the United States and the territories and people of British North America. One of them in particular, which concerns the Fisheries, calls for early settlement, lest the possible indiscretion of individuals should impair the neighbourly understanding which it is on all grounds so desirable to cherish and maintain. I have therefore engaged in amicable communications with the President of the United States.

“In order to determine the most convenient mode of treatment of these matters, I have suggested the appointment of a joint commission, and I have agreed to a proposal of the President that this commission shall be authorised at the same time, and in the same manner, to resume consideration of the American claims growing out of the circumstances of the late war. This arrangement will, by common consent, include all claims for compensation which have been, or may be, made by each Government, or by its citizens, upon the other.

“The establishment of a Prince of the House of Savoy to the throne of Spain, by the free choice of the popularly elected representatives of the Spanish nation will, I trust, insure for a country which has passed with so much temperance and self-control through a prolonged and trying crisis the blessings of a stable Government.

“I am unhappily not able to state that the inquiry which was instituted by the Government

of Greece into the history of the shocking murders perpetrated during the last spring at Dilessi has reached a termination answerable in all respects to my just expectations, but I shall not desist from my endeavours to secure the complete attainment of the objects of the inquiry. Some valuable results, however, have in the meantime been obtained for the exposure and the repression of a lawless and corrupting system which has for a long time afflicted the Greek Peninsula

“The anxiety which the massacre at Tien-tsin on June 21 last called forth has happily been dispelled, and while it will be my earnest endeavour to provide for the security of my subjects and their trade in those remote quarters, I count on your concurrence in the policy that I have adopted of recognising the Chinese Government as entitled to be dealt with in its relations with this country in a conciliatory and forbearing spirit.

“The Parliamentary recess has been one of anxious interest in regard to foreign affairs. But I rejoice with you that my relations are, as heretofore, those of friendship and good understanding with the Sovereigns and States of the civilised world.

“Papers illustrative of the conduct of my Government in relation to the several matters on which I have now summarily touched will be laid before you.

“In turning to domestic affairs, I have first to

inform you that I have approved a marriage between my daughter Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne, and I have declared my consent to this union in Council.

“GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,—

“The revenue of the country flourishes, and the condition of trade and industry may, though with partial drawbacks, be declared satisfactory.

“The Estimates for the coming year will be promptly laid before you.

“MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,—

“The lessons of military experience afforded by the present war have been numerous and important.

“The time seems appropriate for turning such lessons to account by efforts more decisive than heretofore at practical improvement. In attempting this you will not fail to bear in mind the special features in the position of this country so favourable to the freedom and security of the people, and if the changes from a less to a more effective and elastic system of defensive military preparations shall be found to involve, at least for a time, an increase of various charges, your prudence and patriotism will not grudge the cost as long as you are satisfied that the end is important and the means judicious. No time will be lost in laying before you a Bill for the better regulating of the Army and the auxiliary land forces of the Crown, and I hardly need commend it to your anxious and impartial consideration.

"I trust that the powerful interest at present attaching to affairs abroad and to military questions will not greatly abate the energy with which you have heretofore applied yourselves to the work of general improvement in our domestic legislation.

"I commend anew to your attention several measures on subjects which I desired to be brought before you during the last session of Parliament, but which the time remaining at your disposal after you had dealt with the principal subjects of the year was not found sufficient to carry to a final issue.

"I refer especially to the Bills on Religious Tests in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, on Ecclesiastical Titles, on the Disabilities of Trade Combinations, on the Courts of Justice and Appeal, on the Adjustment of Local Burdens, and on the Licensing of Houses for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.

"The inquiry made by a committee of the Commons House being now complete, a measure will be placed before you on an early day for the establishment of secret voting.

"A proposal is anxiously expected in Scotland for the adjustment of the question of primary education with reference to the training of the young in schools on a national scale and basis. That portion of the country has especial claims on the favourable consideration of Parliament, and I trust the year may not pass by without

your having disposed of this question by the enactment of a just and effective law.

“The condition of Ireland with reference to agrarian crime has in general afforded a gratifying contrast with the state of that island in the preceding winter ; but there have been painful though very partial exceptions.

“To secure the best results for the great measures of the two last sessions which have so recently passed into operation, and which involved such direct and pressing claims upon the attention of all classes of the community, a period of calm is to be desired ; and I have thought it wise to refrain from suggesting to you at the present juncture the discussion of any political question likely to become the subject of new and serious controversy in the country.

“The burdens devolving upon you as the great Council of the nation and of this ancient and extended Empire are, and must long continue to be, weighty. But you labour for a country whose laws and institutions have stood the test of time, and whose people, earnestly attached to them, and desiring their continuance, will unite with their Sovereign in invoking upon all your designs the favour and aid of the Most High.”

There was a pretty scene at the close, the Queen kissing the Princess of Wales, and giving her hand to be kissed by the other Princesses present. She also spoke to the Prince of Wales,

and then retired from the House, after making a low courtesy to the assembly.

The Court Circular states that :

“The Queen wore a black terry velvet dress, with a train trimmed with miniver and crape, and a long white tulle veil surmounted by a diamond crown. Her Majesty also wore a diamond necklace, cross, and brooch, the Riband and the Star of the Order of the Garter, the Orders of Victoria and Albert and Louise of Prussia, and Saxe-Coburg and Gotha Family Order.”

The Marquis of Westminster, at the adjourned sitting later in the day, moved the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech, and Mr. Gladstone had selected the Earl of Rosebery to second the motion.

The Earl of Rosebery wore the uniform of the Royal Scottish Archers. He asked the indulgence of the House necessary to a member addressing them for the first time, and who could plead youth and inexperience. His doubt and hesitation were increased by the ability which had been displayed by the noble marquis (Marquis of Westminster). He wished to notice first of all the opening of Parliament by Her Majesty in person, a circumstance which was gratifying not only to the Legislature, but to the entire nation, and was rendered the more interesting by the announcement of the marriage of her daughter, Princess Louise, with the Marquis of Lorne—a marriage dictated

not by dynastic feelings or traditions or State policy, but by the purest affection, and welcome therefore to the whole country. He hoped and believed that the Marquis of Lorne would prove himself worthy of his high distinction, which he would most fitly and naturally do by treading in the steps of the noble duke (Argyle), the Secretary of State for India. Their lordships must have heard with satisfaction of a measure relating to our military forces. It would be inconvenient to anticipate on this occasion the discussion of that measure, beyond expressing the hope that while raising the efficiency of the Army, industrial pursuits would not be interfered with, nor the national taxation unduly increased. The fusion of law and equity and the creation of a High Court of Justice were likewise subjects of satisfaction, and the efforts of the noble and learned lord on the woolsack would, he hoped, this session be successful. Passing to a subject of great interest to many, and to none more than himself—viz., education in Scotland—he might remark that no country was more deserving of having its education fostered by the Imperial Government. The leaders of public opinion, from Fox to Chalmers, had persistently pressed upon the nation the paramount importance of education, and any who had visited Scotland must have observed the results of this. Nothing was commoner than to see a peasant working six months in the year for the purpose of being

able to spend the winter months at the University, barely keeping body and soul together on the pittance he had saved out of the necessities of life. He did not mention this as pertinent to the Government Bill which related to elementary education, but as a proof that it would be a work of love to further education in a country where there was such a thirst for it. Turning to University Tests, he was justified in saying that public opinion had strongly affirmed the principle of their abolition; and the fact that now for the third time within a few years the Senior Wrangler of Cambridge was a Dissenter, and thus excluded from the emoluments and honours which would be lavished upon him were he a member of the Church of England, showed the necessity for a speedy settlement of the question. Her Majesty's Speech referred with satisfaction, which would be shared by all, to the circumstances that two questions which had for a long time been the subject of difference between this country and the United States seemed likely at last to be disposed of—the Fisheries Question and the Alabama Claims were to be referred to a Joint Commission. It might be to the interest of certain politicians in both countries to keep these questions open, but a great nation of kindred blood, language, and political sympathies, and guided by distinguished statesmen, must in the interests of civilisation, which both had at heart, desire to cultivate the most friendly

relations. Their lordships must also, seeing the disastrous effects of the war now raging on the Continent, share Her Majesty's satisfaction at the friendliness of her relation with all foreign Powers. Just before the conclusion of last session a great monarch, at the head of a vast army, and having fortresses of vast strength, was moving against the King of Prussia; but in less than a month that army had melted away, those fortresses were hopelessly blockaded, and that monarch, who had for twenty years swayed the destinies and kept the conscience of Europe, was a captive in the hands of his enemies. Now, while these events were occurring in France, Her Majesty's Government had four objects to attain: first, the preservation of our own neutrality; secondly, the neutrality of Belgium; thirdly, the establishment of an understanding between the neutral Powers which would serve to limit the area of the war; and fourthly, the attainment of peace, or at least of an armistice. There could hardly, he thought, be any difference of opinion as to the success of the Government in attaining the first two objects. The third object Her Majesty's Government had endeavoured to attain, not by making public remonstrances against the policy of Prussia, but by urging their views in a more private manner. The fourth of these objects presented obstacles almost insuperable. On both sides there was a great disinclination for peace, and Prussia displayed

a sensitiveness amounting almost to repugnance at the least interference of the neutral Powers. Indeed, she would rather give an ell without interference than an inch with it. When in France everything which represented organisation and military power had vanished, nothing was so surprising as to see Paris step forward in order to form the nucleus of the national defence; but, after all, this circumstance greatly increased the difficulties by which the neutral Powers were surrounded, as the result was the establishment of a dual Government in France. Still, Her Majesty's Government did all it could, and, in paving the way for negotiations and procuring passes for the negotiators, displayed zeal, tact, and prudence. Meanwhile, the King of Prussia had been proclaimed Emperor of Germany, and the most earnest wish of this country must be, after the war, that the new empire would wield her great power in the interests of peace and civilisation. He thought it might be asserted that our confidence in France had not been shaken by the war. With respect to the Black Sea Question, he believed that the noble lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs had embodied the views of the country in his able despatch, and had earned the gratitude not only of England, but of all Europe by his strong remonstrance against the violation of treaties. After thanking their lordships for the patient hearing they had

accorded him, the noble Earl concluded by formally seconding the Address.

The Duke of Richmond, who immediately followed, said :

“ I wish to express my opinion of the admirable speech in which the noble marquis moved the Address, and of the conspicuous manner in which it was seconded by the noble Earl who has just sat down. It often falls to the lot of those who rise on this side of the House to make a statement of this kind, but I can assure both those noble lords I intend my words to be not a mere empty compliment, but a distinct expression of the opinion I formed while listening to their speeches.”

Lord Granville complimented both the noble lords (Westminster and Rosebery) on their speeches.

The next day *The Times* specially commented upon the dexterity with which the speakers had avoided the subject of the day—the war, and remarked, “an order had been apparently issued that as little as possible should be said about the war.” *The Times* praised Lord Westminster for his first speech in the Lords, and added :

“ Lord Rosebery was even more successful. He spoke with a graceful emotion which became his years, and it was evident that if he controlled himself from dilating on the great events of the autumn, it was not because he was deficient in feeling, but because he was under the restraint

of a discretion which had been imposed upon him. The mover and seconder of the Address in the Lords, like the mover and seconder in the Commons, were hampered by considerations which impeded the flow of their eloquence."

The Daily News said :

"The noble Earl upon the conclusion of this his first speech, for the reception of which he thanked the House, was warmly congratulated by the occupants of the Ministerial bench."

The Standard remarked :

"Lord Rosebery's speech was not very important for the matter, but the manner was, after a fashion, very good. The sentences were well put together, and not ill delivered. But we must wait for other appearances of the noble Earl before we can venture to congratulate the House of Lords upon the increase of its debating power; these good Address speeches are so rarely followed by the acquisition of a Parliamentary position."

The latter critic was wrong, for the young speaker was to be a Minister of the Crown ten years afterwards.

CHAPTER VII

EARLY DAYS IN PUBLIC LIFE—A LISTENER AT FIRST—LADAS AND THE
DERBY—GAMBLING AND HORSE-RACING—SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT
—AN ELECTION SCENE—SPEECHES IN THE COUNTRY—THE YOUNG
EARL AND THE LADIES—EDINBURGH PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY—
"THE UNION OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND"

THE young peer had made a very good beginning in Parliament. He had taken his seat in the House of Lords on May 22, 1868, the Journal of the House on that date recording: "Lord Rosebery takes his seat. Archibald Philip, Lord Rosebery, sat first in Parliament after the death of his grandfather, Archibald John, Lord Rosebery; his lordship having first, at the table, taken and subscribed the oath pursuant to the Statute." What little the House of Lords knew of him for nearly the next three years was as a listener, and not as a talker. The young man was, for the most part, content to hear what those older than himself had to say; and, meanwhile, he was preparing himself for a greater future by studentship in a wider world than the confines of the gilded chamber. His library, the many well-informed correspondents he cultivated, and travel filled up most of the time; while he

took a fair measure of pleasure, retaining a full love of sport and enjoying the ordinary pleasures of society with discretion. His clubs saw a good deal of him, and in the season his bright face and well-groomed figure were constantly seen in the drawing-rooms of the rich. Of another part of his London life—of hours spent in the clubs of the artisans, to learn their ways and their needs; in artisan institutes, where he endeavoured to supply those needs to some extent—I shall write later.

It was in 1869 that he made his first attempt to win the Blue Riband of the Turf. Lord Rosebery has always run his horses for the honour of the thing—to see a good horse beat competitors for the prizes. Ladas was the only horse he ran at the Epsom meeting that year.

It is impossible to turn over the files of the newspapers of the time without noting how keen was the public interest in racing. A year before, for the 1868 Derby, the newspapers had been full of news and comments upon the follies of the young Marquis of Hastings, who, in that year, with Lady Elizabeth, a hot favourite for the Derby, had tried to retrieve the disasters of his rash turf speculations. Lord Rosebery avoided such follies. Those who, when he first went to the turf, gleefully anticipated that there was another rich young man to pluck, found they were mistaken.

From his early boyhood Lord Rosebery has been marked by coolness, steadiness, level-headedness. These characteristics have marked him through life, and they did not desert him on the turf.

When the Derby was about to be run in those days, it was not a question of Parliament being troubled as to whether it should meet on the great day. What troubled a Government was the making and keeping of a House even on the day before the Derby.

In connection with the Derby of 1869 *The Times* in one single day had two leading articles running to over two columns. Then, as now, on the Derby day "the nation of shopkeepers is supposed to have for once forgotten the shop," and *The Times* could concern itself to the extent of a leader of a column and a quarter even over Sir Joseph Hawley's Resolutions concerning two-year-olds. It also appealed to the rough element of the public not, on the course, to amuse itself by cracking open men's heads with soda-water bottles, upsetting people's carriages, or annoying ladies. During the same week even *The Daily News*, *The Standard*, *The Daily Telegraph*, and other papers devoted column after column every day to Derby considerations.

Lord Rosebery was not so soon, however, to have the distinction of winning the great race. The first Ladas was disappointing. There were twenty-two runners, and at the beginning Ladas,

who got away well, ran at the head of the second division. It was an exciting race, and several of the horses got into collision. One was lamed. The race was won by Mr. J. Johnstone's colt Pretender, Pero Gomez being second, and the Drummer third. Belladrum (owned by Mr. Merry) and Ladas, according to *The Times*, trotted in last, some distance in the rear of everything. The first Ladas was a failure, and it was to be many years afterwards before another horse of the same name was to win the race for his noble owner.

What were the views Lord Rosebery held on the subject of racing were mentioned in the House of Lords in 1873. On February 20 of that year he proposed an address praying Her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of this country with regard to horses and its capabilities for supplying any present or future demand for them. The following extract from his speech, though not directly bearing upon the subject, will be read with interest, having regard to his connection with the pastime of horse-racing :

“ Though he had no personal interest in the matter, he could not join in the fashionable denunciations of the turf as selfish, immoral, and as provocative of gambling. It was the custom of honourable gentlemen, well meaning, but possessed of little practical acquaintance with the subject, to go down to the House of Commons and inveigh

against what were somewhat absurdly called 'our Isthmian games.'

"If, in the month of September, an apprentice robbed his master's till, grave magistrates bewailed the fact as a lamentable illustration of what was owing to the Saint Leger. If, in the month of May, an old woman was run over at a crossing, her misfortune was attributed to the Derby. Against such denunciations he would set the words of a gentleman who had certainly no prepossessions in favour of racing, and who said, 'Of itself it is a noble, manly, distinguished, historical, national amusement.' That was a description which must be accepted by noble lords on both sides of the House as above and beyond suspicion, for it proceeded from the Prime Minister.

"If noble lords still had doubts, he wished that, like him, they could have seen two noble lords, eminent for their character and their virtues—Lord Falmouth and Lord Fitzwilliam—running their horses on Doncaster Town Moor, without a bet upon them or any interest beyond that of testing their respective merits. While racing was carried on in that spirit he should consider that it was as innocent an amusement as large numbers of people could possibly enjoy. Hunting and shooting were only for the wealthy, but there was no one so poor that he could not visit a racecourse. He believed that gambling was on the decline, and that there were few owners who

now had as much 'on' their horses as would form the stake on an ordinary rubber of whist. As for putting down gambling by abolishing races, they might just as well, to quote the words of the French wits, think that they could abolish rain by suppressing the gutters."

Earl Granville, in reply, complimented Lord Rosebery on his speech, and suggested the formation of a Select Committee, rather than a Royal Commission, to go into the subject. To this Lord Rosebery agreed.

Lord Rosebery of course saw something of the elections, which were carried on thirty years ago in a much more violent manner than we know them to-day. Broken heads are unusual now as a means of electing a representative to Parliament. They were common enough a generation ago. Our fathers did not probably see anything remarkable in these proceedings; other folks did, however. There was, for instance, an election at Bristol in November, 1868, and *The New York Times* correspondent in this country went down to see it, and supplied the following description to his newspaper:

"Monday morning, November 17, at eight o'clock, the rising sun struggling with a November fog, I went past the Exchange, and found its whole front occupied about ten deep with Tory roughs, each with a blue card on his cap, in high good-humour at being first on the ground, and

ready to rush into the central court, where the nominations were to be made as soon as the great doors were thrown open. An impatient streetful of annoyed Radicals was behind them; and the prospect of getting in or out with a whole coat was not encouraging. Examining the position, I judged it might be flanked, and soon discovered a narrow side-passage, and by paying a shilling I was allowed to go up on the roof overlooking the hustings—a high staging of boards built up on one side of the court, full of committee-men, officials, reporters, candidates, and their friends.

“The clock struck nine, the doors were opened, and there rushed in a yelling, howling mob of eight thousand or ten thousand roughs—so very rough that it was a perfect marvel where they could have come from. Three times as many blocked up the street outside. Then commenced one of those extraordinary displays of popular sovereignty, majesty of the people, British Constitution, and so on which no other country can boast of.

“The sheriff of the county read the proclamation and the writ. He might as well have given them a passage out of ‘Robinson Crusoe.’ Gentlemen nominated candidates and seconded them. They might have been making bets on the next Derby. Reporters stood up heroically, notebook in hand, leaning round the pillars, and the speakers shouted into their ears, and they guessed what was said or intended. Not one single word was heard one

yard from the mouth of the speaker. It was all one deafening confusion of roar, howl, screech, yell, cat-calls, dog-whistles, and every conceivable sound inside, mingled with rotten oranges, raw potatoes, which hit several of the speakers, and other missiles.

“Mr. Morley spoke, or was supposed to be speaking, behind a brown umbrella held up to shield him from the heavy fire. Mr. Miles stood up and risked the shots, but was no more heard than Morley. The sheriff called for a show of hands, or was supposed to do so, for the time had come for that ceremony; and the Blues held up their hands with the Blue Committee, and the Reds with the Red Committee. As the Reds had the most roughs within the enclosure, in spite of the Blues getting the start of them, it was decided that the show of hands was for the Liberals, and a poll was demanded for the Tory candidate.

“This wonderful proceeding lasted half an hour. It could have been spent with more advantage in the roar of Niagara. It was of no more use than if each man had yelped, groaned, hissed, or hurraed in his own private domicile; but as they did this sort of thing in the days of the Tudors, and, for aught I know, in the days of the Druids, they will have to keep doing it.

“An advertisement in the newspapers would have answered every purpose, but even that was needless. Everybody knew there would be an

election on Tuesday. Why then get together for a general yell, a big row, a pelting of the candidates and each other on Monday. Yet this stupid, farcical, red-tape ceremony, useless, expensive, and dangerous as it was, had to be carried out all over the country. Last April rotten eggs were even thrown at the ladies on the roof of the Exchange, and there was a fearful row up there, and cries of 'Throw them over!'

"On Monday, when the High Sheriff was roaring the few words he tried to say into the ears of a reporter, he said:

"'You are called together for the purpose of proposing two fit and discreet citizens to represent you in Parliament. I earnestly beg you to hear every candidate, and I charge, entreat, and urge you to act——' The reporter thinks he was going to say 'like intelligent Englishmen,' but at this instant a rotten orange prevented the completion of the sentence. It was of no consequence. The infernal uproar had not one instant of cessation. . . .

"On Tuesday morning the election began at nine o'clock. Polling-booths were prepared in various districts, as in America, though not so numerous or so well distributed. The roughs on both sides gathered early. It struck me that the Banker Miles's boys, though a rough-looking lot enough, cared more for money than for mischief. The

Trades Unions and the Irish were on the Liberal side, and they were in earnest, and ready to break the peace and heads and windows.

“By noon on Tuesday there was scarcely a whole pane of glass in a Tory committee-room in Bristol. Gangs of Red Radical roughs—harder customers I never saw—bludgeons in their hands, stones in their pockets, eight hundred or a thousand strong, went through the streets, and woe to the shop or tavern with a Tory handbill upon it, or to a man with the Tory colours. They smashed a tavern, drank up the liquor, and then went on to smash another. Tory colours disappeared from the streets; Tory voters dared no longer go to the polls. There was a perfect reign of terror throughout whole districts. The Radicals say there was provocation given—somebody threw a stone at Mr. Morley. That is likely enough; but nobody knows who threw it. Most of the tradesmen kept up their shutters. The surgeons at the General Hospital and Infirmary were actively employed in attending to the severely wounded, who were brought in by scores. Of course there were hundreds of black eyes and bloody noses. The Tories were driven from the field. Mr. Miles had over six thousand votes at four o'clock. Berkeley and Morley had over eight thousand. I judge that the eight hundred Irish votes gave the majority, counting the Tories they hindered from coming to the polls; and, after all, this

victory of physical force is as good as any, and it is what, in the last resort, decides all contests."

Peers would seem to have something to be thankful for, after all. They were able, even then, to take their seats in Parliament quietly.

In Lord Rosebery's first session he said very little in the House of Lords subsequently to that first able speech in seconding the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech. On May 8 the University Tests Bill, for the removal of certain religious tests prior to admission to certain offices connected with the Universities, was carried through Parliament by the Liberal Government. Lord Rosebery supported an amendment to the Bill, to make it apply to clerical fellowships, on the ground that the present arrangement had a pernicious effect. He mentioned that persons intending to study law at Lincoln's Inn took Orders for the purpose of obtaining these fellowships. This drew from the Marquis of Salisbury the humorous remark that the noble Earl must lately have been keeping very curious company. The amendment, however, was not adopted.

About this time Lord Rosebery showed his interest in the affairs of Scotland by asking whether the Government intended to introduce a measure dealing with ecclesiastical patronage in the northern portion of the United Kingdom. The Duke of Argyle, for the Government, replied sympathetically,

134 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

and made humorous allusion to the fact that the Government had already been compelled to begin the ceremony, which was called "the Massacre of the Innocents."

While, however, his remarks in his first session, 1871, after the speech at the opening sitting, were few, the Earl of Rosebery was already being marked as a man of distinction in the country. He had made a considerable impression in Parliament by that first speech on the Address. He was in the same year to give a promise of those brilliant after-dinner orations which were to become one of his characteristics. It was on the occasion of the great Scott celebration in August, 1871, when the people of Scotland with one accord commemorated the peasant-poet and honoured him, on the suggestion of the Edinburgh Border Counties Society. The great festival was held in the Corn Exchange, Edinburgh. The Earl of Dalkeith presided. The report of the celebration occupied four pages of *The Scotsman*, and the list of those present, representing every district in Scotland, London, and other parts of England, New York, and other places abroad, made two closely printed columns.

Lord Rosebery's speech was near the end of the proceedings. He had been entrusted with the toast of the ladies—rather a trying ordeal, as a rule, for a bachelor of twenty-four. Lord Rosebery, in giving the toast, said :

“My Lord Dalkeith, my lords and gentlemen, I rise to propose a toast at a somewhat unpropitious moment. I heard to-day accomplished, by Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, the task which, till I heard him, I believed to be insuperable—to do justice to the hero of the evening; but at this period of the evening, when your appetites for oratory, however insatiable and however refined, must be cloyed and clogged, I have to rise and propose, not a toast to the hero of the evening, nor simply the toast of the heroines of this place at this time, but the heroines of every age and every clime. They have advantages, besides, over the hero of this evening which would be too long wholly to enumerate; but I may mention that they are not merely subjects of the affection to lovers of poetry and fiction, that they are not merely subjects of centenary moments of admiration, but that they appeal to a far larger and more appreciative class of students than any hero that ever lived.

“At an earlier hour of the evening I should have offered a few remarks on Scott in connection with the female character. These remarks the lateness of the hour have happily spared you, and I only dwell on those more general attributes of the day that we can dismiss in fewer words. We may say at once that accident and language and tradition have done more for the sex than for any other body of human beings. Accident—and you

will agree with me, I think, a happy accident—has made our Sovereign feminine; a happy turn of language has made our Church feminine, and has made our ships feminine. I am not sure, by the bye, of the sex of the ironclads, because they came in when nicety of language was going out. A high tradition has made our country feminine—that is, before the present time, when her wishes and her practice have made her neuter.

“My lords, ladies, and gentlemen, there is a feature connected with this celebration which is unique, I believe, in the history of public banquets. Hitherto we have sat down, grim and monastic, in the body of these halls, while the fairest portion of the sex have remained in the galleries secluded behind lattices. This evening a change has come over the meeting which I do not think can have escaped the most casual observer. It is that we are sitting here—except two unfortunate tables, at one of which I am found—surrounded and enlivened by the presence of the sweeter sex. We have been a somewhat more convivial Shakers’ meeting.

“My lords and gentlemen, I would only touch on one more point, and that is connected with this: we have seen women’s rights extended in this particular; but how in this city, at this particular juncture, can we mention the ladies without mentioning their suffrages and their rights? But I will do so in the most compendious manner at

this hour of the evening by saying that it may fairly be argued that no rights are required by those who possess an inherent prerogative to govern men, and that no Legislature can give them a suffrage worth having who are accustomed to receive the suffrages of all mankind. I will only add one word more, and then I shall resume the seat which suits me better than these legs. I shall just hope for one thing—that no gentleman, however old or however young, who hears this toast proposed will do otherwise than think privately, and in his heart, of one, or at most two, of the other sex. If any gentleman—but I do not believe that such a man exists—should be found in this room to drink it without one object in his bosom, or without sufficient enthusiasm, I may hope that the short remainder of this night may be spent by him in an agonising nightmare, in which the ghost of our eccentric country-woman, Miss Jenny Geddes, shall hurl a perpetual footstool at what she would expressively call his ‘lug’ until he comes to a more suitable frame of mind.”

A greater honour and a greater tribute to the growing reputation of the young Earl was to be paid him a few months later, for in November Lord Rosebery was invited by the wise men of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution to deliver an address to them at the opening of their meeting, over which Lord Colonsay presided.

Lord Rosebery took for his subject "The Union of England and Scotland," and a most interesting and able, as well as very long, address it was, and it was thought so highly of by the learned and cultured audience that it was subsequently published in pamphlet form and had a considerable circulation.

In the history of human civilisation and human progress, he said, a fairer page would hardly be found than that occupied by the Scottish Union, for it was not an union such as bound torn Poland to Russia or uncrowned Venice to Austria. Such unions must enlarge a frontier ; they did not create a nation. It added to both nations concerned power, wealth, and honour ; it cost no drop of blood, no shadow of shame as regarded Scotland. It was like nothing so much as a poor man marrying an heiress—mortifying to pride at first ; irksome, perhaps, occasionally ; in the long run harmonious, because founded on interest ; eventually it must be moulded into love by the beauty of its offspring.

There was once promulgated a State taunt, founded on the statement of a baffled plotter, that the Parliament of Scotland had sold for hard cash their support to the Union. One unfortunate nobleman, Lord Banff, had been crucified for the ridicule of posterity as having sold his country and his religion for a ten-pound note.

It was true that the nation was poor, which was

no reproach, and that some peers were unable to attend Parliament unless assistance was given them towards their travelling-expenses. There was no proof of any corruption more debasing than that, a practice adopted by almost every nation upon earth, notably by the newest and most enlightened—the United States of America. Ministers also at last received those long arrears of salary of which Scotch statesmen at that period so constantly complained; but the charge of corruption was so baseless as to be unworthy of notice, while history passed over the Act of Union itself, its jealousies, its discussions, its plots, to record in letters of gold the great internal revolution.

At first, indeed, Scotland seemed but to have made the bargain of Glaucus—to have given her gold for brass, the worth of a hundred oxen for the value of nine. Prosperity and contentment worked slowly indeed, for the Union had not existed two years before a Bill was introduced by the Scotch to repeal it, which was only defeated by three proxies in the House of Lords. The Union had not existed five years before the right of the kirk as to the patronage had been betrayed and destroyed, whence flowed, in an unbroken stream, heartburnings, disruptions, and secessions. Scotland again lost in splendour by ceasing to be a kingdom and becoming a province; her aristocracy became place-hunters in London, the pliant tools of the Ministry of the day. She lost her Legislature,

and gained in exchange a few votes in an alien senate which in no one respect represented her.

She loved well all she lost, but the loss was her gain. It was because of that very loss that she had become, in the nineteenth century, on the whole the most prosperous and enlightened portion of the British Empire. Quiet, steadfast, and vigilant, the Scotch citizens of our day had shown more political capacity than the inhabitants of any other part of the United Kingdom. The intercourse with England, however, came almost entirely from Scotland. The English knew about as much of Scotland as they did of Bœotia, and what they knew they disliked.

Now, indeed, the jealousies and distrust which once separated the two countries divided them no more than did the Roman wall, while it would be waste of time on a self-evident proposition to enumerate the benefits which Scotland reaped from the Union, and which enabled her to smile contemptuously at sixty years of insult and ridicule. Perhaps the shortest way of doing so was to enumerate on one or two points. Scotland's poverty. Before the Union her judges were paid but £200 a year. The Commissioners of the Union did not extend the hackney-coach duty to Scotland because there were hardly any hackney-coaches to levy it upon. Fifty years afterwards there were no hackney-coaches and not half a dozen private carriages in Glasgow.

The whole currency of Scotland was not £600,000. Glasgow in 1709 was supposed to have lost £10,000 by the loss of a fleet, which was deemed incredible. In the hundred years following the Union the Excise increased to more than fifty times the first yield. Scotland was rated by the Union to pay less than one-sixtieth part of the land tax paid by England. It was needless to multiply instances of the kind; they might indeed be summed up by pointing out how strong must be the counter-balancing advantages which had made Scotsmen forget for ever the strongest passions of their ancestors. And there was a still further proof of an indirect kind of the enormous change that Union effected in the fortunes of Scotland.

The question was constantly asked, "What did Scotland give for all these benefits?" "What did Scotland lose by the Union?" Except her Church, she lost all that she held most dear. She was very poor, but she was intensely proud, and she believed herself to be the equal of England in all but the fortuitous circumstances of climate and soil. She solaced herself in her troubles with the notion that she had given England her kings. The Union was passed, and the Scots saw themselves, for the sake, as they thought, of some commercial advantages which few understood, and which the vast majority despised, reduced from a king-giving kingdom to a province without

a Legislature ; with a haughty aristocracy ignored and despised ; with a capital inferior indeed in size to London, or in refinement to Paris, but still famous and brilliant ; shorn of its Court, its society, and its Parliament, descending to the level of a country town. Scotland lost that. To them, indeed, the sacrifices might seem trivial. They could neither, as subjects, regret the Stuarts, nor, as men of business, the Scotch Legislature ; the aristocracy were no longer ignored ; and as for Edinburgh's history, for Edinburgh stripped of her Court, of her aristocracy, and her estates, who would say that they had not gloried in her ten times more since she lost those ornaments ?

Had they to select the proudest period of Edinburgh's history they should not choose the century that followed in preference to any that succeeded the Union. For a moment the de-throned beauty retired behind a veil, but only to reappear in the fairer attributes of renewed youth. During the splendid epoch which succeeded, she sent forth, perhaps, more brave, more wise, and more famous men than any city in the world. Historians and lawyers, philosophers and statesmen, doctors and architects, soldiers and novelists, wits and economists, poets and rhetoricians, all sprang from her fertile bosom. Their ancestors put their hands to a mighty work, and it prospered. They welded two great nations into one Empire, and moulded local jealousies into a common

patriotism. On such an achievement they must gaze with awe and astonishment, the means were so adverse and the result so astonishing; but they should look on it also with emulous eyes.

Great as was that union, a greater still remained. They had in their generation to effect that union of classes with which hitherto power was a phantom and freedom a farce. In those days the rich man and the poor gazed at each other across no impassable gulf; for neither was there in this world an Abraham's bosom of calm beatitude. A powerless monarchy, an isolated aristocracy, an intelligent and aspiring people did not altogether form the conditions of constitutional stability. They had to restore a common pulse, a healthy beat to the heart of the Commonwealth. It was a great work—the work of individuals as much as of statesmen, alien from none of them, rather pertinent to them all. Each in his place could further it. Each one, merchant and clerk, master and servant, landlord and tenant, capitalist and artisan, minister and parishioner, they were all privileged to have a hand in this work, the most sublime of all, to restore or create harmony between man and man, to look, not for the differences which chance or necessity had placed between class and class, but for the common sympathies which underlie and connect all humanity. It was not monarchs or even statesmen who gave the country prosperity and power. France in 1789 had a

virtuous monarch and able statesmen; but the different classes of the community had then become completely estranged, and the upper crust of society was shivered to dust by the volcano beneath. In this country the artificial barriers which separate class from class were high enough, but, thank God! they were not insuperable. Let them, one and all, prevent their becoming so. A great page recorded the bloodless and prosperous history of the Scottish Union; a greater page lay vacant before them, on which to inscribe a fairer union still.

CHAPTER VIII

INTEREST IN FOREIGN QUESTIONS—THE ALABAMA CASE—MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS—SCOTCH EDUCATION—LIFE PEERAGES—CHURCH PATRONAGE—LORD ROSEBERY AND MR. TOOLE, THE ACTOR—ROYAL TITLES

FROM 1871 onwards for several years the voice of Lord Rosebery was not often heard in the House of Lords, but when he did speak it was always on some matter which showed that he was taking a deep and earnest interest in a great variety of public questions.

In May, 1872, we find Lord Rosebery indicating his interest in our foreign relations by moving for returns as to the number and nature of the extradition treaties between the United Kingdom and other nations.

On the evening of June 4, 1872, an important debate took place in the House of Lords on a motion, brought forward by Earl Russell, to the effect that an address should be presented to the Queen praying Her Majesty to give instructions for the suspension of the arbitration at Geneva relative to the famous Alabama case, until the indirect claims advanced by the American Government should be withdrawn. Earl Granville,

on behalf of the Government, earnestly deprecated the pressing of the motion, brought forward as it was at a critical juncture. Lords Salisbury, Derby, and others took part in the debate, in the course of which Lord Rosebery expressed himself strongly against the motion and in favour of the position of the Government. He thought it would be most unwise to break off the negotiations at this moment by passing a vote of censure on the Government, which would be the effect of passing the motion before the House. To ask of Her Majesty's Government a declaration that they would not go before the arbitrators in Geneva if they did not first obtain the withdrawal of the indirect claims was not a course which ought to be adopted.

Lord Cairns, who spoke subsequently in support of the motion, complimented Lord Rosebery on his speech.

It remains to add that on the debate being resumed, after an adjournment, three days later, Earl Granville announced the receipt of a communication from the American Government, which Earl Russell regarded as a withdrawal of the indirect claims. The latter therefore withdrew his motion.

On February 8, 1873, he again evidenced his interest in the matter of extradition treaties by inviting the Government to state generally the present state of affairs as to these.

The second reading of the Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill, briefly known as the Ballot Bill, which had passed the Commons by a considerable majority, was moved in the House of Lords by the Marquis of Ripon on June 10, 1872. A hostile amendment to the effect that the Bill should be read again that day six months was moved by Earl Grey. Lord Rosebery contributed to the debate a speech in favour of the measure, the second reading of which was carried by a majority of thirty.

Lord Rosebery has on every possible occasion indicated the keenest interest in Scottish questions. On the occasion (July 5, 1872) of the debate on the second reading of the Education (Scotland) Bill, Lord Rosebery expressed his hostility to the application of any portion of the rates to the teaching of denominational religion. When the report stage of the Bill was reached, a few days later, Lord Rosebery moved the extension to Scotland of the now celebrated Cowper-Temple Clause. He could not agree that the religious difficulty had no existence in Scotland. As for the "Shorter Catechism," he thought that none of their lordships who knew the document would think it a proper one for children of between five and thirteen years of age. He proposed his clause in the hope of making the measure a peaceful settlement of a long vexed question.

The amendment, which was strongly opposed

by the Duke of Argyle, who held that the attempt to proscribe formularies was not a Liberal but a most illiberal course, was eventually negated without a division.

A discussion took place in the Lords on the subject of life peerages on July 4, 1873. Lord Rosebery—to whose name is appended, in an explanatory parenthesis in *The Daily News* report, the words “a very young peer”—raised a laugh by remarking that any proposal affecting the privileges of the House would have most interest for those who in the course of nature might expect to remain longest members of it.

Church Patronage in Scotland called for attention in the same year, and on June 17 a discussion took place anent a resolution adverse to the appointment of ministers by patronage to churches belonging to the Established Church of Scotland. Lord Rosebery supported the motion, at the same time expressing the opinion that the system had for some time been practically obsolete.

In the following session the Government of Mr. Disraeli, which had just come into power, brought in a Bill to abolish patronage. Lord Rosebery again spoke in favour of the course, regretting that the late Liberal Government had not themselves introduced such a measure during their recent tenure of office. Subsequently, when the Bill was being considered in committee, he opposed an amendment which would have had the effect

of giving ratepaying parishioners, as well as communicants, a voice in the election of a minister for a parish. The amendment, after considerable discussion, was eventually rejected.

In the same year (1874), on June 12, there was a discussion on the Parliamentary position of Scotch and Irish peers. Lord Rosebery moved the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the method of electing representative peers for Scotland and Ireland, and to report whether any changes were desirable. The appointment of the desired committee was agreed to.

Subsequently (June 22, 1875) Lord Rosebery stated that he did not intend to introduce any Bill founded on the recommendations of the committee to deal with the question of the representative peerage of Scotland, owing to the difficulties in the way of such a measure. The question of the Irish peerage was considered some days later, when Lord Stanhope moved an address to the Crown praying Her Majesty to relinquish her prerogative of creating peers of Ireland. In the course of the debate, in which a number of peers took part, Lord Rosebery criticised the Government on the ground that they had not ventured to enunciate an open and plain policy on the matter. The motion, in an amended form, was eventually adopted by the Government.

Further interest in foreign matters was shown

on July 26, 1875. Lord Stratheden and Campbell then submitted a motion condemnatory of a note delivered in the previous autumn by Austria, Germany, and Russia to the Ottoman Porte, and regretting that effectual measures had not been taken to obviate the conclusion of a treaty between Austria-Hungary and the Danubian principalities. In the course of the debate that followed, Lord Rosebery remarked that the object of the three Powers was evidently political rather than commercial.

When Mr. Disraeli proposed the Royal Titles Bill to give the Queen the title of Empress of India, Lord Rosebery opposed the measure, which throughout the country aroused a great deal of feeling and displeasure.

On Monday, April 3, 1876, the Bill was debated in the House of Lords. The chamber presented an unusually animated appearance. The seats on the floor were fully occupied, and the available space was thronged with members of the Lower House and many other interested visitors. The motion to go into Committee on the Bill having been formally made, Lord Shaftesbury moved an amendment to the effect that an address should be voted to the Queen, praying Her Majesty to assume some title other than that of Empress. The Lord Chancellor (Lord Cairns), on behalf of the Government, opposed the amendment, which was supported by Lord Selborne,

Lord Rosebery, after repudiating the suggestion that the Opposition were animated by party feeling in the matter, pointed out that it had always been the contention of the jurists of this country that the title of king was absolute in its nature, and that it was fully equal to the title of Emperor. The opposition to the Bill had not come from those who were opposed to monarchical institutions, but from those who had for the last sixteen or twenty years been the advisers of the Crown. It was no party feeling that influenced them. After a humorous comparison of the title, to be used for India only with the medicines "for external application only," he wound up by asserting that the Opposition opposed the measure because they believed it to be derogatory to the Crown of England, because they believed it to be unwise and unnecessary, and above all because they believed that in touching the outward form of the monarchy they in some sort touched its inward spirit and dignity.

The amendment was of course lost, the majority against it being forty-six.

We find Lord Rosebery, on March 13, 1876, interesting himself in the administration of the affairs of Heligoland, and asking for the production of papers relative to the Constitution granted to the island in 1864, and, as it seemed to him, somewhat arbitrarily abrogated four years later. Lord Carnarvon, on behalf of the Government, made

a conciliatory reply, with which Lord Rosebery expressed himself satisfied.

During the year 1874 the progress of Lord Rosebery's reputation and the great diversity of his interests were shown in two ways. One was by his being chosen to preside over the Social Science Congress, and the other was the request that he would preside at the farewell banquet to Mr. J. L. Toole, the actor, just before he left England for a tour in America.

These interests would seem to be as far as possible apart, yet the young Lord Rosebery, twenty-seven years of age only, was considered the best to be asked to fill the positions. *The Era*, in its description of the event, says:

"A distinguished nobleman, whose speeches in the House of Lords had recently obtained for him high distinction, at once acceded to a request that he should preside on the occasion . . . with the Earl of Rosebery in the chair—a young peer of high attainments, whose speeches on a wide diversity of subjects have attracted lately the greatest attention. The most distinguished presidency was assured."

The company over which Lord Rosebery presided included Henry Irving, Barry Sullivan, G. A. Sala, Douglas Straight, Thomas Thorne, Edmund Yates, C. F. Partington, C. T. Mathews, Lord Alfred Paget, Edward Ledger, W. S. Gilbert, Charles Dickens, William Cheswick, John Billington,

W. P. Frith, R.A., Sir Julius Benedict, Horace Farquhar, and Captain J. E. F. Sylmer.

Lord Rosebery, in connection with the loyal and patriotic toasts, referred to the affection of the Americans for the Queen. "From personal experience I am perfectly sure that there is no place even in Her Majesty's dominions where her name and her character are more dear and more appreciated."

Lord Rosebery proposed the toast of the evening, "Success and long life to Mr. Toole." He said :

"If ever there was an occasion for a bumper toast it is the one that I am now about to propose to you. . . . I suppose there is not one of us here who has not had the advantage more than once of hearing those perplexing orations which Mr. Toole is in the habit of delivering, which, sublime in execution as they are, are yet so complicated and so mysterious in their delivery that they have often reminded me of what after-dinner speeches of Shakespeare may have been, if we can only imagine that the immortal William was exceedingly drunk at the time. . . . It has only reached me by a side-wind that reliable statistics have proved that no young man of my age has ever spent so much money in stalls to hear Mr. Toole as I have. I used attentively to attend Mr. Toole's performances, and I have only to mention as a drawback to those who may feel

inclined to follow my example that, though you could have heard a pin drop in the house, and though I had read Mill's 'Logic' for hours and hours before going to the theatre, yet when I returned home and attempted to draw up an abstract of the speech I had heard, it was not so clear or so logical as I should have expected from so eminent a man. They were brilliant sentences, no doubt; but when you came to put those epigrams together according to the rules of Mill and Aldrich you found there was the third premiss wanting, which no human ingenuity could supply. . . .

"I must say that it is impossible I can do justice to my admirable and honoured friend in any after remarks I may now choose to make. Steadfast and true as has been his character in every walk of private life, his public career has been so various and so complex that one cannot touch upon all the incidents in one evening's sittings. I should like to see a series of banquets given day after day in his honour until we had exhausted all the various phases of his character. Still, although that might redound to his immortal glory, I am doubtful whether it would not result in his precipitate death from indigestion. I should like to see a banquet on the first day at which the Lord Chancellor should preside, and at which the judges of the Bar of England should be present, to give their professional and legal opinion as to the merits

of Mr. Hammond Coote and Mr. Sergeant Buzfuz. On the second evening I should like to have a dinner over which Admiral Rous should be the chairman and George Fordham the croupier, and they should give an opinion as to the merits of Mr. Toole in the pigskin; and on the third occasion I should like to have light refreshment, with the members of both Houses of Convocation, the entire bench of bishops, and the great clerical dignitaries present, to dilate upon the manner in which Mr. Toole had reformed the rogue, Don Giovanni, by transforming him into a pusillanimous and harmless young man.

“I am not a dramatic critic, but I can give you in a very few words the result of my experience. I have often been to see Mr. Toole, as I said before, and whenever I have been to see him I have always entered the house with a feeling of discontent, grumbling to myself that I was perfectly certain he would not be so good as he was the last time I saw him, and I have always left the house with the feeling that I had never seen him half so good in my life. I cannot account for that.

“Then there is another feeling which I believe has been felt by every human being who has seen him, whether in town or the provinces—that whenever he has seen Mr. Toole he has not only spent a delightful evening, that he has not only seen an actor of undeniable talent, but that he has met an admirable friend, because

there is a geniality about his performances which spreads an electric chain round about his audiences, and makes them forget the actor in the friend.

"You will read in the third volume of a book recently published a very curious account of how an illustrious man, who has passed away from us but recently—I mean the late Charles Dickens—went down to Walworth at some personal inconvenience to see the beginning of a new actor. Dickens admitted that he showed some promise, and he wished to encourage him by his presence and patronage; and that actor was our guest of this evening. I cannot help thinking that if that great genius, Dickens, were able to revisit for a day the scene of his early triumphs, he would think it not the least of his successes in this world that he had introduced us partially to an actor who has been the means of evoking so much happiness and so much sympathy in this country.

"We have seen the beginning, but we have not seen the end. We see here a man who has not reached the summit of his prosperous career. . . . I have to arraign Mr. Toole on three counts, but I will not interpose longer than I can help between the jury and the counsel for the defence. I have to arraign him on the possession of admirable talents; I have to arraign him also on having conferred more happiness, probably, than any human being in this room; and for having detached

us from our loyalty by making us all his friends, and of possessing the magic and irresistible power of creative sympathy.

“ I have only one word more to say, and that is an allusion to an anecdote that I heard of our guest only the other day. He was told that a few friends would like to give him a dinner before he went to America, to whom the illustrious guest replied, in a manner that I am perfectly certain you can all figure to yourselves, though I cannot imitate it, ‘Why do they want to give me a dinner? I am not in the least hungry.’ I can understand that remark if Mr. Toole’s appetite was one for public applause, because it must have been long ago satisfied. But I should like to tell him in the presence of this company why it is we have given him this dinner to-night. We have given it to you, Mr. Toole, because we appreciate the humour which is always genial and which is always pure ; because we are grateful to you for the many happy evenings we have spent in your presence ; because we feel that the humour is one which is grateful alike to age and to youth and to childhood, to the genius and to the fool, to every class and variety and condition of life. But we might have felt this equally, and simply waited for stalls to go and realise it in our persons ; but we wished, further, to give you this dinner because we feel that we are about to lose you. We are about to lose one who is

a household delight to England, who has done more to charm the nation than probably any one man now living ; and that, to paraphrase a famous writer, the harmless gaiety of nations is about to be eclipsed.

“ If we have to spare you at all we would rather spare you to our cousins across the Atlantic than to any other nation upon earth. It would be difficult for any Englishman to obtain a cold welcome in America. What we have to fear for you is not a cold welcome, but that American enthusiasm may induce you for a moment to forget English applause ; and we can only express the hope that American enthusiasm will not make you forget English devotion of many years, and that though you may leave your new acquaintances with reluctance—and I have no doubt you will—you will return to this old country with some pleasure, remembering that you have here a nation of friends, to whom we trust you may be spared for many years to afford new delight. I will now only ask the company to drink your very good health, and may God speed you on a happy and prosperous voyage.”

Commenting upon the speech, *The Era* remarked :

“ The choice of the Earl of Rosebery for President was the happiest that could be made ; and the force and fluency of his speeches, associated with the most winning mode of delivery, called

forth the warmest expression of admiration. Nothing, indeed, was wanting to make the event memorable in the history of the stage as a splendid acknowledgment of the dignity of the dramatic art."

Lord Rosebery again showed his interest in the theatrical profession on March 5, 1875. A question was then asked in the House of Lords concerning the closing of certain theatres on Ash-Wednesday. Lord Rosebery joined in the discussion which followed, expressing the opinion that it was hard upon the theatrical profession that they were obliged to remain idle when all other trades and professions were permitted to carry on their avocations. If there was a peculiar sanctity on Ash-Wednesdays, then people ought not to go about their usual business; but in this case the theatrical profession alone was prohibited from doing so. In the interest of logic, some change in the law ought, he thought, to be made.

CHAPTER IX

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN—WORK FOR THE
ARTISANS IN LONDON—RELATIONS WITH THE REV. HENRY SOLLY
—THE CLUB AND INSTITUTE MOVEMENT—THE REPUBLICAN
AND “MR.” ROSEBERY—THE SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS—
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS—RELATIONS OF CAPITAL AND LABOUR

IT was the doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man, of the mutuality of the interests of all classes of the community, that Lord Rosebery preached to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society in 1871. That is what he has always believed in and never failed to impress on suitable occasions on his audiences. He has endeavoured, with much success, to learn to know the working classes at home and abroad. In London one who was of great assistance to him in gaining this knowledge was the Rev. Henry Solly, with some of whose early efforts to increase the technical knowledge of the artisans the father of the compiler of this book was associated.

It was through this gentleman that Lord Rosebery came into close touch with many men who were working hard for the improvement of the artisans—men like Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice,

Prebendary Rogers, Samuel Morley, Arnold Morley, Hodgson Pratt, G. J. Holyoake, Professor Stuart, James Heywood, etc. Through Mr. Solly he saw what was being done or attempted in the club and institute movement for the industrial classes, work the initial stages of which have been described so fully in Mr. Solly's book.¹ In striking contrast with the splendid institutes of to-day were the efforts of those who began the movement. Mr. Solly succeeded in getting established a "Trades Guild of Learning." Earl Granville was President. It started well, but was later abandoned. Mr. Solly says :

"Seldom has any society had a better start in the world, and everything promised for it a useful and successful career. But its brilliant commencement and magnificent proportions exposed it to the usual danger of attracting persons to take part in it who would have their own ends to serve, and were determined to convert it, if possible, into an instrument for working out their own purposes. In this case those ends were not mercenary. They were men who had long wished to gain influence with the great Trade Unions of the kingdom, and with the working classes generally, for purposes which they considered to be of high importance ; and they did not realise the injustice of winning the

¹ "These Eighty Years." By Henry Solly. London : Simpkin Marshall & Co., Ltd.

confidence of the originators and managers of this new movement—after all the labour and time spent on laying its foundations—and using it to secure their own objects, instead of forming a society for themselves. Then there were misunderstandings, with the usual jealousies and suspicions, among some of the working men. All this last would, however, have been overcome had it not been for the endeavours made by the one or two more educated men (including the appointment of a young friend of their own as secretary) to obtain possession of the movement, and drive the coach themselves. The worst of it is that in almost all such cases when disagreeable symptoms begin to show themselves, and unpleasant altercations occur, the well-disposed men absent themselves, so that those who are still striving earnestly to keep the society to its legitimate course find themselves deserted and powerless at the most critical time. Thus, in spite of every attempt to push forward our operations, the time of the council meetings was lost, and the temper and patience of the members naturally exhausted by the secret yet systematic obstruction practised. These delays gave opportunity and occasion for all the minor elements of discord and hindrance to come into play. Every new society that commences on a democratic basis is exposed to these evils, just as a turnip crop is beset with insect pests—and both escape

the danger only by rapid growth. Delay in growing or acting is fatal for a time, perhaps permanently."

That was not a pleasant experience for the pioneers of the movement, who were so discouraged that they left the guild, which came to an end some little while afterwards. Mr. Solly, however, set himself to work to start a new and better body, and had men like the Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Lyttelton, the Earl of Harrowby, Lord Rosebery, and Mr. Samuel Morley to help it forward. About the same time, and largely by the aid of the same men, recreation-grounds were opened at Willesden, and flower-shows and window-gardening for the industrial classes were encouraged. At last Mr. Solly drew out a plan for an "Artisan's Institute" for technical training, for instruction in science and art, history, political economy, English literature, grammar, elocution, etc., with provision for "Mutual Improvement" discussions and weekly entertainments. Mr. Samuel Morley promised £500 towards it. Other support was given, and soon premises were taken near Upper St. Martin's Lane at a rental of £115 a year. There was space for five or six classrooms, and a lecture-hall capable of holding from a hundred to a hundred and fifty people. Lord Rosebery took a keen interest in the work, and though, like Mr. Hodgson Pratt, he was unable to attend the inaugural *soirée*, held on October 14, 1874, when Mr. Samuel Morley took the chair,

he sent a letter explaining why he was unable to come. In the following year (1875) this Artisan Institute sent a deputation to Mr. Cross, then Home Secretary, on the subject of the "Dwellings of the Poor," which had some effect upon legislation then pending regarding the housing of the poor and their displacement through the demolition of insanitary dwellings or other improvements. Mr. Cross subsequently saw Mr. Solly privately, and was shown by him a card model of suggested tenements for the poor in Westminster.

From the modest beginning of the Institute much good proceeded, and several of the city companies made small contributions. It was found, however, necessary to get more funds, and an attempt was made at the annual meeting of 1875, which the Duke of Westminster allowed to be held at Grosvenor House. The Duke took the chair, and he and Lord Lyttelton urged the claims of the Institute. Mr. Rogers, the rector of Bishopsgate, was present, and had his interest greatly excited by what he heard. Lord Rosebery, who was also present, gave a handsome contribution to the funds. The publication of the proceedings led to great public interest and enlarged subscriptions, and the worries of Mr. Solly in connection with the Institute's finances were practically over. Mr. Solly recalls a curious and characteristic scene one evening when they were holding one of their larger discussion-meetings,

and the Earl of Rosebery had come to preside. Mr. Solly says :

"I forget what the subject was that night, but several friends of the Institute, among them Lord Lyttelton and some other distinguished men, were present. Early in the debate one friend, a Republican saddler, rose to speak, and began : 'Mr. Rosebery,' whereby I rose at once and said that Mr. Elliott was quite at liberty to abolish the House of Lords if he could constitutionally, as well as all titles into the bargain, but that he was not at liberty to be rude to my guests, and that I would not allow it. A considerable portion of the meeting no doubt sympathised with Elliott in his Republican views, but it went with me so heartily that he did not repeat the offence, and in a subdued tone briefly gave his opinions on the subject discussed.

"When the meeting was over, and Lord Rosebery was going, I said we were greatly obliged to him for presiding, and I was sorry this man had behaved rudely. 'Oh,' said Lord Rosebery, 'if these men only knew how little we care for our titles, they wouldn't make such a fuss about them,' and seeing Elliott, with others, standing by the coffee-bar as he went out, he held out his hand, saying, 'Come, Mr. Elliott, let us shake hands ; I'm not such a bad fellow, after all.' When I saw Lord Lyttelton (who had gone away just previous to this finale) a few days afterwards, and told

him of it, he replied, 'Oh, I'm not in the least surprised at Lord Rosebery shaking hands with Elliott, I only wonder at Elliott's shaking hands with him!'

" Lord Rosebery was finely consistent and true to his own view of the case in this matter of titles when he was Chairman of the London County Council; and he has done a large amount of good work for his country. But I doubt if he knows how much he has been helped to gain the means and opportunity of exercising his really noble qualities and great abilities in her service by beginning public life as the Earl of Rosebery instead of as 'Mr. Primrose.' Yet he would have become a great man and a true patriot (if adequate health and strength were given him) under any name or title. Not very long ago I was surprised and gratified to learn that I had had the privilege of being amongst the earliest to discern his capacities for goodness and greatness; for at the close of the Annual Meeting of the International Peace and Arbitration Society, held at the Westminster Palace Hotel last year, Major de Winton, whom I had frequently met at Social Science Congresses, and who had just been moving a resolution at the meeting which I had seconded, came up to Mr. Hodgson Pratt and myself, saying, *à propos* of something, I forget what, 'Why, Mr. Solly, you were the first to introduce Lord Rosebery to public notice in London. Don't you remember it?'

'No, indeed I don't,' I replied. 'Yes, it was at a meeting at the Society of Arts, and you introduced him, saying he was a young nobleman of great promise and ability.' Then I began to have some faint recollection of the circumstance, for I certainly had an impression, given me long previously, of the nature the Major expressed. May he long live to fulfil, as he is now doing, the bright and noble promise of his early years!"

Subsequently the Social and Political Education League was established, and Lord Rosebery presided over one of the annual meetings. Mr. J. A. Froude, Mr. James Bryce, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Professor Dicey, Mr. Leslie Stephen, Mr. R. B. Haldane, Q.C., M.P., Mr. Brassey, M.P., Mr. George Howell, Sir Harcourt Johnstone, M.P., Sir J. C. Laurence, took an interest in the work. Lord Rosebery strongly urged the importance of the work. "The Artisans' Technical Institute" was subsequently formed with the help of Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., Mr. J. Williams Benn, M.P., Mr. John Burnett, Mr. O. V. Morgan, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, Mr. Thomas Twining, and others. Mr. Walter Hazell, M.P., Mr. (afterwards Sir John R.) Robinson, Mr. Sydney Buxton, M.P., Mr. Pye-Smith, Mr. Manfield, M.P., were also connected with developments of the work of Mr. Solly.

It was no doubt owing to the part Lord Rosebery had taken in the work of Mr. Solly in

the early seventies that the organisers of the Social Science Congress of 1874 sought to get Lord Rosebery to preside. It is unnecessary to more than state the distinction it was for a man of twenty-seven to fill that position.

The Congress was held in September, 1874, in Glasgow. Lord Rosebery, as President of the Congress, delivered the inaugural address, in the course of which he laid special stress on the value of education for all classes of the community. The occasion is interesting as being that of Lord Rosebery's first visit to Glasgow, a fact to which he made allusion. The address, of which a report was given in *The Scotsman*, was thoughtful, earnest, and eloquent. The Lord Provost of Glasgow (Sir James Watson) subsequently expressed his astonishment at the varied information contained in it, which indicated that the speaker was a shrewd observer of the signs of the times. That this appreciation was fully justified will be indicated by a perusal of the address. The Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, M.P., spoke appreciatively of Lord Rosebery as a type of the aristocracy of the future.

Lord Rosebery, in the course of his address, said :
"To my mind, a body like ours has no more direct or important duties than the attempt to raise the condition of the nation by means which Parliament is unable or disdains to apply. Here we have an illimitable field of operations. Parliament

can give a workman a vote, but it cannot give him a comfortable home. Nor can it sift and exhibit the many contrivances which may be placed before him of bettering himself, of increasing his capacities, and enlarging his enjoyments. All this lies within our province, and it is work incalculably more important than the great mass of our Parliamentary legislation. In this city we are surrounded by a great aggregation of humanity—seething, labouring, begrimed humanity; children of toil who have made Glasgow what she is, and alone can raise and maintain her; not mere machines of production, but vehicles of intelligence, mixed in nationality and various in opinion. You cannot appeal to them by common feelings or uniform interests. They are there a dark and mighty power, like the cyclopean inmates of *Ætna*. I must honestly avow my conviction, though to those who see how many there are who profess to represent and understand the working classes it may seem rash, while to others it will seem a truism, that this vast labouring population of ours has not made itself, its wants, its creeds, and its interests sufficiently intelligible to many of us. How, indeed, if it be otherwise, is it that the problems connected with their condition have advanced so little towards solution? How is it, otherwise, that each political party claims with equal certainty, and on every point, to possess the sympathy and

the confidence of the working man? How else is it that, when the working class makes its voice heard on any question, it comes upon us like thunder in a clear sky? I avow myself no exception to the rule; but for that very reason, perhaps, I can conceive no subjects more interesting than those which relate to the welfare of our labouring population.

“The moment is as suitable as the place for the discussion of these vital and national questions. In times such as these, of high wage, of general peace, of immunity from furious political discord, the well-being of the labouring classes often appears secured, and does not always attract the attention of statesmen. It is, however, precisely then that it is possible to take measures which, without exciting jealousy on one hand, and suspicion on the other, may secure that well-being in less prosperous times. It is then that even the Greeks may innocently bring gifts. But should there come a European war such as we weathered successfully at the beginning of the century, but which left us surrounded for the most part with battered wrecks and with stranded hulls, we might possibly find our teeming population, confined within so small an ark, a perilous and disheartening agency. Moreover, while our numbers increase in a greater proportion daily, it would seem that for a few years our principal outlet for emigration

may be partially blocked up. It appears more than probable that for some time, owing to late commercial disasters, and it may be because corn-growing in the west has been somewhat overdone, the United States will not find employment for that quarter of a million of emigrants, more or less, that we are accustomed to send to her. This is the most important problem that can occupy statesmen, and at the same time the most difficult for a statesman to face. For Parliament can seldom see its way to interference ; nor is it indeed desirable that it should do so.

“ Legislatures and governments have at various times attempted by direct laws to benefit the working classes : but the most obvious instances of this—the national workshops of 1848, and the decrees of the Parisian Commune in 1871—have been conspicuous failures. It is well, then, that in this present time, so peaceful and blessed for us, we can here discuss, however slowly and imperfectly, the pregnant topics which our programmes suggest.

“ And there is so much to be done ; our civilisation is so little removed from barbarism. At this moment there is a daily column in the newspapers devoted to recording brutal outrages, where human beings have behaved like wild beasts. Every policeman in London is assaulted on an average about once in two years. Within the memory of living men, the workers at the

salt-pans of Joppa, only a mile or two from Edinburgh, were serfs—*adscripti glebæ*—and sold along with the land on which they dwelt. Neither they nor their children could remove from the spot, or could alter their calling. The late Lord Provost of Edinburgh, who bears the honoured name of Chambers, records his having talked to such men. What a hell, too, was that described to Lord Ashley's Commission of 1842! In the mines were women and children employed as beasts, dragging trucks on all fours, pursuing in fetid tunnels the degraded tasks which no animal could be found to undertake. We know that equal horrors existed in the brickfields two or three years ago, when there were thirty thousand children employed, looking like moving masses of the clay they bore, whose ages varied from three and a half years to seventeen, and when an average case was thus described: 'I had a child weighed very recently, and though he was somewhat over eight years old, he weighed but $52\frac{1}{2}$ lb., and was employed carrying 43 lb. of clay on his head an average distance of fifteen miles daily, and worked seventy-three hours a week. This is only an average case of what many poor children are doing in England at the present time, and we need not wonder at their stunted and haggard appearance when we take into account the tender age at which they are sent to their Egyptian tasks.' Then again:

'All goodness and purity seems to become stamped out of these people ; and were I to relate,' says a witness who himself worked in the brickfields, 'what could be related, the whole country would become sickened and horrified.' It would not indeed be difficult, and it would be painfully instructive, to draw out a dismal catalogue of facts to prove how little the splendour of our civilisation differs from the worst horrors of barbarism.

"And yet, after all, we can only come to the hackneyed conclusion, that the sole remedy for this state of things is education, a humanising education. It is not a particularly brilliant or original thing to say, but severe truth is seldom brilliant and original. There is a noble passage in 'De Tocqueville,' known probably to all and too long to quote here, which points out that knowledge is the arm of democracy, that every intellectual discovery, every development of science, is a new source of strength to the people, that thought and eloquence and imagination, the divine gifts which know no limit of class, even when bestowed on the enemies of the popular cause, yet serve it by exalting the natural grandeur of man, and that literature is the vast armoury, open to all indeed, but where the poor, who have hardly any other, may always find their weapons. These, I say, are features of education which all recognise, though some may profess to

dread them. But there is a general expediency besides.

“Take the case of machinery. The winter nights of 1830 were bright with blazing rickyards. No farmer in the southern counties felt his stacks safe. There was a time of terror in England, and of retribution. Or take the Luddite riots of 1812 and 1816, where cunning and furious mobs nearly stamped out lace manufacture at Nottingham. The broken frames and the burning ricks were ignorant protests against machinery. Well, intelligence has marched a little, and what is the case now? What do the Associated Masters—no unduly partial authority—affirm? ‘The accuracy of this statement is manifest from the fact that the operatives are now the earnest advocates for improvements in machinery, whereas twenty years ago it was no uncommon thing for them to strike at the factory where they were introduced.’ Here, it seems to me, we can put our finger on definite and tangible progress, due solely to increased intelligence.

“Take another case which shows the need of it. Wages were probably never so high in England as in 1873. Nine years before an increasing spirit traffic paid £9,692,515 to the Excise. In the last financial year the Excise receipts from spirits amounted to £14,639,562. I am not one of those who are appalled, certainly not surprised, by this expenditure. But see how

it strengthens the argument! A man who has little but natural instincts to guide him comes into a fortune, and at once procures himself an increased quantity of what has been in smaller doses an enjoyment and a solace. Has he been educated to find his amusement elsewhere? If one of us should succeed to a large fortune to-morrow, we certainly should not spend our inheritance in drink; but the difference, I venture to say, is one solely of culture. Well, my contention is that in an educated country, among a nation educated not in Shakespeare and the musical glasses, but so instructed as to be able to find amusement outside the public-house and the skittle-alley, a great increase in wages would not have been followed by so enormous an increase in the consumption of spirits; and an enormous consumption of spirits means an enormous amount of crime and pauperism. The assertion is capable of proof which is almost direct. The best educated country in the world is Saxony. This is what a Saxon mining superintendent says: 'We have a few who drink brandy, but as a rule they are steady.' Take another country where education is universal: 'In 1819 compulsory laws, requiring every parent to educate every child, were enacted in Prussia. At first, of course, there was a violent opposition and the usual hue-and-cry of "invaded rights"; but in twelve years crime and pauperism have diminished 40 per cent.' Moreover, we

not only suffer morally, but materially. Pay-day in England is often followed, not merely by drinking, but by a blank as regards work. 'If you pay,' says Mr. Brassey, 'wages weekly on Saturday, it rarely happens that any considerable amount of work is performed on the Monday.'

"Take the colliers. The papers have been filled for the last year or so with anecdotes of the colliers, their immense earnings, their expenditure in champagne, and horses, and hot-house fruit. I am persuaded that there is a large section of society which believes that the colliers pass three days a week in sucking peaches and driving tandem. But what is the state of intelligence among even the younger generation of colliers? 'Out of fifty [lads] examined in nine different night-schools in 1867,' says Mr. Sandford, 'twenty-nine, or 58 per cent., could not read.' And yet we wonder that our colliers do not invest their earnings wisely!

"I will only put one more case. Improvements in locomotion have made life more easy, but also more cheap. Our lives are staked on the exact intelligence of each of a great number of comparatively uneducated men. When we recollect the nice adjustment, the momentous punctuality, which are required of a pointsman or a signaller, and all that depends on them, we should ensure that such responsibilities should not be cast upon men whose faculties have not been carefully trained.

In addition to all the other chances of life, there is but a point which separates a railway passenger from death. And yet we act as though education were desirable indeed, but not imperative.

“Well, but it may be asked, to what does this recital of known facts tend? To a very simple proposition. I cannot believe that there ever was a more clear necessity before any government or any country than the imperative duty laid upon ours to institute a directly compulsory education. Among the upper classes such compulsion exists, more stringent than any enactment that a legislature can frame, and one which every pressure in this direction laid on the lower classes will increase threefold; the compulsion is moral and the penalty is extinction. If the upper class shall become less educated than the class beneath it, we may take it for granted that by a natural process of subsidence that upper class will sink to the bottom, and that lower class will rise to the top. We are told that such an enactment would be an interference with individual liberty, and that the nation is not ripe for it. If the assertion be true that the nation is not ripe for the reception of an undoubted benefit,—a benefit as clear and as certain as fresh air and pure water—we can only be the more certain that this education is greatly needed. If it be seriously argued that the interference with individual liberty is too stringent, we must call into the witness-box

Macaulay's well-known schoolboy to assure us that a policeman, a tax, and a railway bill are all direct interferences with individual liberty. The natives of Scotland are not considered unduly servile, yet they submit to compulsory education. The same cry was raised in Prussia more than half a century ago, but the education of her people has not merely effaced Jena and its consequences, but produced the German Empire of to-day.

"In these days knowledge is strength and immediate strength, and education has revived in its most startling aspect the exploded doctrine of the balance of power. It seems certain that that unhappy phrase, which, like a perverted rod of Moses, was only applied to cause streams of blood to flow, will be verified with regard to educated and uneducated nations. We raise armies with great distress and expenditure—armies from which the annual desertions are little less than six thousand—we never weary of forging plates of iron with which to resist cannonades we trust never to encounter—we construct artillery which we hope may rather be superseded than employed—we impose loads of taxation for all this, and we heedlessly neglect the true leverage of all present empire. I venture to suggest that a Social Science Congress has no fairer field than to urge upon Government this peaceful method of supremacy, so congenial to its theories, and that no government worthy of the name should shrink from

an invasion upon these, forsooth, sacred liberties of the subject.

“The question is one of security, but power requires something more. We require, if we would remain what we are, a special education of two kinds. The first I would venture to urge, with the more confidence, as your memorial on the subject has done so much, is general instruction in economical principles. The science of political economy is not at this moment, perhaps, in particularly good odour. It is fashionable for people who pride themselves on being warm-hearted to flout political economy; though I think that those who have heard Mr. Fawcett speak, or who have read the Autobiography of John Stuart Mill, would deny that political economists are bloodless beings. But, in spite of easy sarcasms, the fact of direct utility remains.

“Take the case of strikes. Strikes are only one development of that slow but gigantic process by which, all over the world, capital and labour are readjusting their relations, and that supreme tendency in this age, of men as well as of nations, towards glomeration. In the first clash of conflict they may have disturbed our trade; but, with a larger intelligence, based on economical principles, is it not certain that each side will discover that their prosperity must be mutual and their interests inseparably entwined? Again, consider for a moment. Strikes are rare in Germany; in

Wurtemberg, where every individual in the kingdom above the age of ten can read and write, they are unknown. It is true that in the United States, owing perhaps to sudden commercial crises that have occurred there, they are on the increase ; but it must be honourably remembered that the Executive Committee of the New York Tailors' Union in 1869 announced the termination of their strike, and at the same time their determination to abjure strikes for the more valid support of co-operation. What are the bloodiest and most perilous strikes whereof we have record ? Surely the strike of the Belgian miners in 1869, and the strike at Creuzot of January, 1870, which was suppressed by bayonets, and which anticipated the Commune. In both countries 30 per cent. of the population are unable to read or write. From both countries proceed the wildest economical theories. Is it fanciful to see a connection between these facts ; to believe that a comparatively slight knowledge of economical truths would prevent vexatious strikes ; or at any rate to hope that the day may come when the relations of capital and labour may be largely improved by the teaching of political economy in our public schools ?

“ If a State, after doing its duty, has time to consider expediency (and this indeed, as the world goes, is reversing the order of things), it should consider whether in these days, when the essence of prosperity is commerce, and the essence of

commerce is rivalry, it be not well by special training to fit the producers for production, and the distributors for distribution. The want of this special education is the real requirement of our industry, without which certain natural advantages, supposed to be inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race, will not avail us in the struggle for commercial predominance. It will not be new to you to hear that, without technical knowledge, and without a generally diffused knowledge of the principles of trade, a nation may easily lag behind in the world of commerce.

“ We are living now riotously and recklessly ; we are consuming far more coal than we need ; we are spending selfishly the rightful heritage of our posterity. Instead of this, our anxiety should surely be to husband our powers, and to educate our people, for we have no new dominions to explore ; our island is no more capable of expansion than a quarter-deck. We should look the future boldly in the face. See the effects of technical education in one simple face. Switzerland is hemmed in with mountains, her climate is unfavourable, her soil is limited, her one resource of water-power is precarious and expensive ; she has no coal and no harbours ; yet she threatens the silk trade of Lyons, and takes the ribbon trade of Coventry. Her exports of silk alone rose in the eleven years between 1860 and 1871, 147 per cent. in quantity, and 132 per cent. in value. Can

any cause be assigned for this but the complete and special education which she gives in primary schools, and practical schools, and trade schools, and secondary schools, and cantonal schools, all topped up by the great Polytechnic Institute of Zurich? The Swiss manufacturer lives simply, he is a master of his business, and his workmen, with whom he is perpetually in contact, respect him for this. Master and servant have often been at the same school learning their craft; they know it thoroughly, and though it is said that an English operative will get through in ten hours as much work as a Swiss in twelve, yet, judging by results we may believe that the technical knowledge of the one brings him on a level with the physical capacity of the other. And the mention of Switzerland leads me to say that technical instruction is needed as much by the master as the workman. Mr. Scott Russell, in his interesting book on technical education, points out with great force how the practical ignorance of the master may earn him the contempt of the men. The ignorance and the distrust produce the middleman, who still further estranges the two parties, and the result is complete want of sympathy on both sides, with all the evils that that want implies. The master becomes a remote figurehead, the interest of the workman in his work passes away, with the honour of perfection and the pride of finish. Hence there originate those modern

contrivances which designedly suppress superiority in order to produce a dead level of wage for the good worker and the bad—contrivances which may serve the temporary purposes of strategy, but which strike at the root of character.

“In another branch of technical education we are almost entirely deficient—I mean a rational education for commercial pursuits. The German clerk who comes to England astonishes our merchants not merely by his mastery over two or three languages, but by his mastery of the principles and rationale of his business. In a nation like ours it would be supposed that there would be ample means of instruction in commercial principles and practice. As a matter of fact there is but one professorship of the principles of commerce in the United Kingdom, and that has neither endowment nor scholarship. It is probable that technical and commercial education will have to be provided by the State in England; it is more than probable that it will not be provided till our eyes have been opened to its necessity by grave and painful facts. But here in Scotland we have educational endowments bequeathed by commercial men for the benefit of their class, which are of little use at present, and which might fairly be devoted to giving practical commercial and technical education. There is the noble revenue left by George Heriot, who, from what we know of his character, would have rejoiced

to see these days of prosperity in Scotland, and to further that prosperity with his fortune. A Royal Commission is giving its attention to this subject, but it has no executive powers, and public opinion has more influence on these points than a hundred royal commissions. And it should be remembered that if Scotland, out of her endowments, could set on foot a successful practical or polytechnic school, she would—to paraphrase the words of Pitt—‘having saved herself by her energy, save England by her example.’

“Again, take the case of agriculture. It has been said that the agricultural production of England might be doubled if more capital were put into the land. It is not easy to verify statements of this kind, but it is certain that more special knowledge of agriculture would have to precede the larger application of capital. I suppose there is no country in the world where so much farming-capital is laid out to the acre as in the lowlands of Scotland. But this was not the case till Lord Haddington, at the beginning of the last century, sent for farmers from Dorsetshire (where perhaps a return of the favour might not be unwelcome now) to give special agricultural instructions in his neighbourhood. What a demand there is for special agricultural education, not merely on behalf of young men who wish to become British farmers or land-agents, but

of those who intend to emigrate to our colonies! See how many youths there are who come to board with our great farmers as pupils in agriculture! The efficacy of this method is indeed doubtful: the pupil has generally too much independence, and the tutor not enough authority; but this very fact proves the strength of the demand. And these are the men who go out to our colonies and influence the destinies of future empires. Would it not be well, then, as the demand for this education exists, and as it has so direct a bearing on the prosperity of the country and of our labouring classes, that the Government, or we ourselves, should devise some means of meeting it?

“The only class for which, so far as I know, technical education is never even proposed, is the class for which it is most necessary—I mean our rulers. Is there any school or college in Great Britain which professes to educate men for government or statesmanship? Eton, I believe, trains a very large proportion of our legislators, yet I have grave doubts if Eton provides any special instruction for them in their future duties. We have medical colleges, and clerical colleges, and military colleges; and some of the best minds of the country are now devising schemes of legal education. We have no hereditary surgeons, or priests, or soldiers, or lawyers. We have, however, a large body of hereditary legislators; we have a

considerable number of men who are hereditary legislators during good behaviour, for they, and their fathers before them, have sat in Parliament so long as they were solvent and respectable. But for these technical education is not provided nor even contemplated. We agree that an artisan cannot do his work properly without special instruction; but for those to whom we entrust our fates, our fortunes, and our honour, no such training is requisite. It is expected and assumed that a peer shall take to politics as a duck takes to swimming. Nor have we improved on our fathers. Macaulay tells us that it was considered wonderful that the elder Pitt had never read 'Vattel.' But can we feel any certainty that every Member of Parliament has read 'The Wealth of Nations'? Suppose candidates for Parliament were examined like candidates for the Civil Service, or for commissions in the Army, should we discover the sure traces of training in political history and political economy? I venture to say that there are many Members of Parliament who would themselves be the first to lament the deficiencies of their education in their craft, and the labour with which they had at a later and busier period of life to repair them.

"But to return to the artisan class. The agencies I have named are external, but there is an internal agency by which workmen have effected much for themselves—I mean by applying

the principle of union. It is true, of course, that unions among workpeople, with a view to the artificial raising of their wages, may hamper production and harshly control freedom of action. On the other hand, they have often been of real service by promoting intelligent communication between workpeople in different parts of the country, and in ascertaining the due recompense of labour. Few impartial persons will be disposed to deny that, though it has caused bitter feelings on both sides, as all such revolutions must, the great social movement which has recently united the English peasantry is likely to diffuse enlightenment, to encourage independence, and to place wages on a more clear and rational footing. The natural adjustment of the right proportion between the profits of capital and the wages of labour is a tolerably sure, it may be, but certainly a very slow, process, and union among workmen has had a beneficial effect in hastening it. Strikes, which cause so much distress and which so greatly hinder production, we must lament. But so long as capital and labour continue distinct and opposing interests, is it likely that strikes will be rare? Co-operation, indeed, is the obvious remedy for all these troubles; but co-operation can hardly, so far, be considered a success in this country. It appears to require a more general intelligence and a greater accumulation of capital among the working classes

than exists at present. The largest co-operative association for productive purposes in this country is that of the Ouseburn Engine Works. Yet even here, with the strictest co-operative democracy, a strike has recently taken place of certain of the workmen against the association—that is against themselves. In agriculture the Speaker of the House of Commons attempted a co-operative experiment so favourable to the workmen that, even had it succeeded, it would have been no pledge for the success of ordinary co-operation. Yet his men, although they were to receive when the year was good, and to lose nothing when the year was bad, did not, it appears, take a single share. So that, as regards co-operation, we cannot say that at this moment we have much reason to look for assistance from that quarter.

“ But union as a principle (and union of some sort must of course precede co-operation) is the great watchword of our age. Nowhere has the multiplication of unions been more extraordinary than in the United States. The very names of some of them are quaint enough—the Advocates of Justice, the Knights of Honour, the Sons of Toil, the Brethren of Labour, the Sovereigns of Industry. But incomparably above these there towers the gigantic association of the Patrons of Husbandry, commonly called The Grange, a great agricultural co-operative independent union.

Its progress has been amazing. Its first Grange, or lodge, was formed in the last month of 1867. There are at this moment 20,500 Granges, with 1,311,226 members. At the end of the year it is certain that they will have 30,000, with 2,000,000 members. The order is practically identical with the agricultural population of six States, and with two-thirds of the farmers in ten others. In Missouri alone there are said to be 2,150 Granges; they are making way in Canada. Pennsylvania began the year with six lodges, and at this moment she has 800. Why this enormous increase? The answer is simple, for it is alleged that membership adds not less than 50 per cent. to the income of the Granges. The Californian Granges have their own fleet, and ship their corn direct to Liverpool, by which they saved two million dollars in freights in the year 1873. Their vessels bring as return cargoes tea, sugar, coffee, silk, and other commodities, which are retailed to members at cost price; and a system is being organised by which their ships shall return with loads of every foreign article which the members may need. They are thus an independent mercantile nation. But they are more: they have a social, religious, and political, as well as a co-operative aspect. They have a secret password, renewed annually; Grange banks, Grange plough-manufactories, Grange grocery-stores, besides Grange poems and Grange

burial-services. They declare that they are going to labour for the good of all mankind, of which they intend to raise the standard. They mean to secure obedience to the laws and general brotherhood, and, on the other hand, to suppress fashion, bribery, and selfish ambition. Their very success has made them run into extravagances: but that success is a social symptom we cannot afford to disregard.

“To pass to the physical condition of our workmen, a great problem at once presents itself in the dwellings of our urban poor. This is a subject which we hope to hear discussed in one of our sections; and indeed it is locally interesting, for it is one of the fields in which the present honoured Provost of this city has gained distinction. Municipal improvements and the increased value of land in towns are daily thrusting the home of the artisan farther from the scene of his labours. This in itself is by no means an evil. The demolition which obliges the crowded inhabitants of an alley or a close to seek homes in a purer air may always be considered a blessing; where tramways exist it certainly is so. Tramways have done much in many places to solve the great question of healthy and handy dwellings for our workmen. They are indeed the inconvenience of the opulent and the luxury of the poor. You may always measure exactly the extent of democracy in a country by the extent of

its tramways. But for a concentrated nation like the population of London, tramways are insufficient. Trains form the means of transit between the work and the home of the artisan. Of late, however, a tendency, to call it by a mild name, to the discontinuance of cheap early trains, has been shown by railway companies, partly because they are not profitable, partly, it may be, as a means of compelling the Legislature to abolish the passenger duty. This raises the large question, which is always perilous for undertakings of great public utility conducted by private enterprise, how far railways should be regarded as purely commercial speculations which need not regard national interests in the very least. If the Legislature shall once be called upon to weigh the privileges accorded to railway companies against the conveniences they concede, it will probably not treat the question as purely one of dividends.

“But besides the facilities of railroad and tramway, other efforts have been made to solve in some degree this difficulty. There are the buildings erected by the Peabody trustees, where, however, some inconvenience is said to be caused by the rule that no work may be done at home. Nor is it quite clear that the tenants are of the class for which the houses were intended. Then there are several building companies which not merely provide excellent dwellings, and thereby raise the character of the other houses in the

neighbourhood, but which pay fair dividends besides. Thus the Metropolitan Association pays an average dividend of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Improved Industrial Dwellings Company pays 5 per cent. The London Labourers' Dwellings Society pays 5 per cent. The Artisans' Labourers and General Dwellings Company pays 6 per cent. This last association has built the Shaftesbury Park township, which was inaugurated under brilliant auspices this year. There are no public-houses or beershops on that estate, but the demand for the cottages, some hundred in number, far exceeds the supply, and the success of the undertaking has been so great that the directors have just bought another property in Harrow Road which will accommodate fourteen thousand more inhabitants. 'While Parliament,' writes the manager, 'is discussing these questions, I venture to submit that we have practically solved the problem.' Nor can I disagree with him.

"In other countries we may notice the curious experiment of the Social Palace of Guise, but which at present is only an experiment, and one which probably would not adapt itself to the habits of this country, as well as the Cité Ouvrière at Mulhouse, which, however, affords us no assistance as a precedent, for one half of the required capital was contributed by Government. In Belgium, also, the Messrs. d'Andrimont have erected a very complete hotel, the Hotel Louise, for their colliers,

which gives a fair return for the capital invested, and where the food is as economical and as good as in one of the famous cheap dining-rooms of this city. In New York the difficulty of getting good houses for the poor is greater if possible than here. The houses are built by great landlords, most of them large owners of real property, who lease them to middlemen, who in their turn sub-let them at an enormous profit. The owner gets 6 or 7 per cent. for his outlay, the middleman makes from 15 to 30 more out of the tenants. The consequence is that rents are enormous, and in the opinion of many eat up the difference between the wages of unskilled labour there and the same wages here. It is only fair to add that the case of New York is exceptional. It is greatly overcrowded, owing to the immense number of immigrants who, landing there, proceed no farther. In Philadelphia things are much better. An excellent system prevails there, by which landlords build neat, small houses, and let them directly to working men for about 6 per cent. on the investment, with the privilege of buying outright at the original cost during a certain number of years. In this way there has grown up in that city a large class of small freeholders who are probably the most prosperous body of their class in the world, and a very backbone of strength and order in the commonwealth.

“ Another great effort is being unobtrusively

made for the comfort of the populace. The enjoyments of club life, which have such an attraction for the Anglo-Saxon race, are being extended to the artisan. The admirable promoters of this movement believe, with fair reason, that as public-houses offer social attractions to the tired workmen irrespective of drink, so clubs are the most formidable competition which the public-house can have. There are at least five hundred and fifty-five working-men's clubs in England and Wales, and twenty-four in Scotland, embracing altogether about ninety-two thousand members. Here surely is a definite social agency with indefinite possibilities.

"We all know to a certain extent the history of factory legislation; how the sacred tradition of the great work was handed down by the first Sir Robert Peel, whose claims to national gratitude have been so beautifully obscured by the greater claims of his illustrious son, to Oastler and Sadler, and Hobhouse and Ashley, and Mundella. In the last session of Parliament the main principles of Mr. Mundella's Factory Bill, embodied in a Government measure, passed through both Houses, so that the hours of labour for women and children are now limited to fifty-six and a half in a week. But although much has been effected, it may be regarded as serious that so keen and independent a thinker as Mr. Fawcett should have offered determined resistance to the

Bill. His argument was founded on the assumption that those whom the Bill is taking care of are well able to take care of themselves, which is at least a doubtful proposition, and that legislative interference to be logical should be complete, and should extend even to women employed in domestic service. But no one would deny that if great injury to women were to be apprehended as an effect of domestic service,—that if, for example, every master was a Legree and every mistress a Brownrigg,—the Legislature would have to interfere for the protection of maids. Nothing of the sort is, however, pretended. Now we have evidence, and very complete evidence, that injury is done to women, and not merely to women, but their descendants, by their undue employment in factories. Parliament must, in consequence, determine what limitation must be placed on factory labour, not merely for the protection of weak women now, but in its own Imperial interests for the preservation of health in the children of these women—the future citizens of the country. Nor is it certain that Mr. Fawcett's other assumption, that the classes affected are well able to take care of themselves, is in any degree correct. It is certain that women, from love of approbation, as well as from those feelings of unselfishness which do honour to them as wives, are only too easily led to work beyond their powers. But ours is not the only field; the battle has been

fought and won almost everywhere. If there were no other argument, the factory legislation of other countries, adopted in these feverish times of commercial competition, would be sufficient reason for action.

“But there is a higher ground for this legislation with us than with any other nation, and one on which every topic I have urged to-night rests for its support. The conditions of life in this country are rapidly reversing themselves. Wealth is doubling itself, and increasing the population; greater care in management and subtlety in mechanical appliances are diminishing, and must further diminish, the proportion of persons employed, especially in agriculture; here is the problem, daily a greater population, daily in all probability less work, which means less subsistence.

“We are shut up by the sea with our surging myriads—a source of strength if guided and controlled; if not, an immeasurable volcanic power. Many of them must go forth to people the world. Our race has colonised and colonises, has influenced and influences, and in future ages seems likely further to colonise and influence a great part of the habitable globe. So great has been our field of influence that we can only view it with awe. It has been, and is, a great destiny for this country to sway so mightily the destinies of the universe. But the great privilege involves a sacred trust. We must look to it that the fertile

race we send forth to the waste places of the earth is a race, physically, morally, and intellectually equal to its high duties. At present we will not compel our children to be educated, however rudely ; at present, in one of our cities nearly a quarter of the infants born die before they are one year old. In one of your sections you propose to discuss, 'What are the best means of drawing together the interests of the United Kingdom, India, and the Colonies?' I submit that the primary means are to send forth colonists who shall be worthy of the country they leave and the destiny they seek.

"The different agencies I have noticed to-night all tend to this: Whether we keep them in England or they pass from us, we must look to the nurture of this race of kings. We annually distribute through the world a population nearly as large as the population of Birmingham ; in the last two years more emigrants have left our shores than there are inhabitants in Glasgow and Dundee put together. After all, whatever our commerce or political influence may be, this is the most gigantic enterprise in which this or any other nation can be engaged ; and the responsibility of its success, not merely for the present, but for countless future generations, lies with us. Will this great stream pass from us a torpid flood, composed of emigrants like some we now send forth, who shake the dust from their feet

and swear undying enmity to us, or shall it be a broad and beneficent river of life, fertilising as the Nile, beloved as the Ganges, sacred as the Jordan, separated from us, indeed, by the ocean, but like that fabled fountain Arethuse, which, passing under the sea from Greece into Sicily, retained its original source in Arcadia? We do not know what our fate may be; we have no right, perhaps, to hope that we may be an exception to the rule by which nations have their period of growth, and of grandeur, and of decay. It may be that all we most esteem shall fade away like the glories of Babylon. But if we have done our duty well, even though our history should pass away, and our country become

An island salt and bare,
The haunt of seals, and orcs, and seamews' clang,

she may be remembered not ungratefully as the affluent mother of giant commonwealths and peaceful empires that shall perpetuate the best qualities of the race.

"I am led to make these remarks specially here, for we are constantly asked why we exist when there are Parliaments and Convocations and Synods who discuss with ample fulness every imaginable topic. Now I have only mentioned one of the topics with which a Social Science Congress is specially fitted to deal; yet how vast this single subject appears! Indeed, it is

"The Volcanic Influence of Social Theory" 199

difficult to see any limit to the possible usefulness of a meeting like the present. The questions relating directly to the amelioration of our race rarely occupy the attention of Parliament. The existence of a Congress for the real promotion of Social Science should be an important national fact. Moreover, no one who would appreciate a Social Science Congress can forget that we live in remarkable times, times of social development so ominous that we may be approaching a period of social revolution. What a change from that old world whence this fertile brood of nations sprang! On the one side, a dark, surging mass of barbarians; on the other, the inevitable stern immobility of the Roman Empire. Now the whole universe seems undergoing the volcanic influence of social theory. Everywhere there is breaking out some strange manifestation. The grotesque congregation of the Shakers, the agricultural socialism of Harris, the polygamous socialism of Mormon, the lewd quackery of Free-Love, the mad blank misery of Nihilism, the tragic frenzy of the Parisian Commune, are portents no observer can neglect. Some try to solve the problem of life by abolishing property, some by a new religion. Most of these experiments thrive in America, which alone has room for such diversities of opinion and practice. It is too much the fashion to treat these various organisations as a mixture of knavery and folly. Two,

indeed, of these phases of humanity will receive more attention from the historian of the future than they attract from their contemporaries—I mean the Commune of Paris and the Church of Latter-Day Saints. That eccentric Church is a socialism founded on a polygamous religion, and ruled by a supreme pontiff. But it would be a mistake, I think, to suppose that polygamy is an essential part of Mormonism. The traveller in Utah will be struck most, not by the plurality of wives, but by the prevailing industry and apparent external brotherhood. Again, whatever may be thought of the Commune of Paris, which issued quaintly ingenuous decrees, and which ended in blood and iron, it will always remain one of the sinister facts of our age. Like the Ninevite king, it perished in a blazing pyre of what was fairest in its habitation, and the world lost so much in those flames that it cannot now pass judgment with complete impartiality. But as a gigantic outbreak of class hostility, as a desperate attempt to found a new society in the very temple of the old, it has hardly perhaps received sufficient attention. Far be it from me to attempt to palliate the horrors of that disastrous conflict; they are, however, only terrible accessories. But the ominous fact of that sudden social revolution is a portent which cannot be blotted from the history of humanity.

“While human beings then remain human

beings, and while efforts like these are made for complete social reorganisation, a Social Science Congress has even more scope than a Parliament. Besides the special legal business by which this association has long been distinguished, and which is connected with its birth, it can, as I said, watch and record civilisation ; it can attend to those social matters to which Parliament cannot or will not attend ; it can discuss and prepare projects of legislation which may be subsequently adopted by the Legislature ; it can criticise with the advantages of special information and freedom from party prejudice the Bills actually laid before Parliament ; it can ventilate and sift theories which are not yet ripe for reduction into a practical form ; it can keep in view as its special and supreme duty the furthering of every scheme which has for its object the making man more self-reliant, more comfortable, more independent of Government and such external agencies, better citizens, and happier men. And in accomplishing this we achieve yet more. One beautiful result of these labours is to bring together, from all parties, from numberless nations and creeds, so many real friends of humanity, bound here in a sacred league looking to a sacred end, however much they may differ as to the means. Never was such a league so much needed as now in the history of the world. Never was there on all sides so much of energy and skill

given to the preparation of those efforts by which civilisation is retarded and mankind made miserable. The armies of the four great military Powers when on a war footing engross three millions and a quarter of men in the prime and flower of life. Three millions and a quarter of men in four countries, with their swords ready to the grindstone, form a portentous, silent fact which we cannot ignore in the halls where we discuss the efficacy of arbitration in settling disputes between nations. In Spain we see a war of dynasty; in America a conflict of colour. The night is dark and troubled; we can but labour steadfastly, hoping for the dawn, united by the sympathy of the living, and animated by the example of the dead. In this spirit, gentlemen, I trustfully inaugurate this Congress, and commend you to your labours, convinced that, earnestly pursued, they must be useful, and may bring forth fruit an hundredfold."

CHAPTER X

ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE TO MISS HANNAH DE ROTHSCHILD—A
BRILLIANT CEREMONY—SOME WEDDING PRESENTS—LORD RECTOR-
SHIPS—ABERDEEN AND EDINBURGH—ELOQUENT ADDRESSES—
SCOTTISH HISTORY, ASSOCIATIONS, AND CHARACTERISTICS—A
DISCOURSE ON PATRIOTISM

SOCIETY, which had for long been concerned as to the probability of Lord Rosebery's marriage, learned positively at the close of 1877 that he was engaged to Miss Hannah de Rothschild, the only daughter of the late Baron and Baroness Meyer de Rothschild. Rumours of his engagement had been many, and had extended over a considerable period. They had been specially numerous during his lordship's absences in America, where the paragraph-writer had been an active person long before his habits became a feature of journalism on this side of the Atlantic.

Lord Rosebery's alliance with the great Jewish family of financiers naturally created exceptional interest. Miss Rothschild's father and mother had kept a beautiful home at Mentmore. They were large-hearted, broad-minded philanthropists. Their riches were used to benefit the many. Charitable works occupied much of their time and thoughts.

They were loved by all—friends, tenants, beneficiaries. Miss de Rothschild was trained in an atmosphere of human sympathy. She, like her father and mother, regarded wealth as a trust. No one could have discharged that trust more generously, more kindly, more ably. Had she been the first Rothschild to marry outside her own community, the religious aspect of the union would have created more comment than was the case. But the other members of her family had provided precedents which helped to make her own action less conspicuous than would otherwise have been the case. The first union of the kind was that of a sister of Baron Lionel de Rothschild with the Hon. Henry Fitzroy, brother of a former Lord Southampton. The second and third cases were the marriages of the two daughters of Sir Anthony de Rothschild—the one to the Hon. Eliot Yorke, and the other to Mr. Cyril Flower.

It was on March 20, 1878, that the wedding took place. It was a brilliant ceremony—the society event of the year.

The Act of Parliament regulating marriages by a registrar provides that a religious service may, to satisfy the conscience of either or both contracting parties, be afterwards read; but of course this reading does not legally strengthen or in any way affect the actual bond of marriage, which can only be once performed between the same couple.



THE LATE LADY ROSEBERY.

The permissive clause of the Act was taken advantage of.

The first, or civil, ceremony was performed at the district registrar's office, Mount Street, Berkeley Square. The attendance of friends was so large that the board-room was used instead of the usual office, and this room was beautifully decorated with plants and flowers. Accompanying the Earl of Rosebery was Lord Carington,¹ while Miss de Rothschild came with her cousin, Mrs. Cohen, and a few other friends. Before the registrar, Mr. T. Worlock, the bride and bridegroom made the usual declarations of a civil marriage, and afterwards signed their names, the contract being attested by Mr. John Samuel, Lord Leconfield, Viscount Lascelles, Miss Sarah Cohen, Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, and Lord Carington. The bride at this ceremony wore a plain morning-dress of brocaded silk and a fur-lined cloak. Her bonnet was trimmed with pearls, with a jewelled rose in front.

After the declarations Lord Rosebery took the wedding-ring off the superintendent-registrar's book and placed it on the wedding-finger of the bride's hand. While the newly married couple stood hand-in-hand before him, Mr. Worlock said: "The marriage is now com-

¹ The surname of Carington was confirmed by Royal license in 1880; subsequently in 1896 his lordship was by Royal license allowed to assume the surnames of Wynn-Carrington

pleted. I hope you will live long and be happy."

The religious ceremony took place at Christ Church, Mayfair, where at half-past ten o'clock there was a large and brilliant gathering. When the service commenced every seat in the church was occupied. One of the first to arrive was His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge. He occupied a seat immediately in front of the communion table. Among others present were the Prince of Wales, the Duke and Duchess of Cleveland, the Earl and Countess Stanhope, the Marquis of Hartington, the Earl of Orkney, Lord and Lady Leconfield, Lord and Lady Colville, Sir Coutts and Lady Lindsay, Colonel the Hon. W. and Mrs. Carington, the Hon. Edward Stanhope and Countess Tolstoy, the Hon. Mr. and Mrs. Bouverie, the Earl and Countess of Effingham, Mr. Christopher Sykes, M.P., the Marquis of Stafford, and Mr. Banks Stanhope.

Lord Rosebery arrived shortly after half-past eleven, accompanied by Lord Carington, who, in the absence of Captain Tyrwhitt through indisposition, acted as best man. The bride came to the church with Mrs. Cohen and Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, and at the church entrance she was received by the Prime Minister, the Earl of Beaconsfield, and by the bridesmaids.

Before the ceremony an allegretto from

Mendelssohn's *Lobgesang* and the War March from the *Athalie* were played by Mr. Stokoe, organist of the church. The bride was led to the altar by the Prime Minister, by whom she was given away. She was dressed in white satin with a brocaded train, and a veil of Brussels lace with orange blossoms, but she wore no ornaments except a very lustrous pair of diamond and pearl earrings. Her four young bridesmaids were the daughters of Lord Stanhope, Lord Leconfield, and Sir Coutts Lindsay. After the ceremony Mendelssohn's *Wedding March* was played by Signor Randegger, and the register was signed and witnessed by the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Cambridge, the Duke of Cleveland, the Earl of Beaconsfield, Lady Leconfield, and the Rev. Prebendary Rogers.

Another account, written by one with more eye for detail in dress, says the bride wore a princess dress of the richest pearl-white satin duchesse, with trimmings and deep flounces of exquisite point d'Alençon, divided by orange-blossom fringes. Over a wreath of orange blossoms descended a large veil of the very finest point de l'aiguille, which descended to the flounces of the dress, and corresponded in artistic design with the Alençon flounces. The four bridesmaids were the Misses Euphemia and Helen Lindsay, cousins of the bride, the Hon. Mary Caroline Wyndham, daughter of Lord and Lady Leconfield, and Lady Emily

Margaret Stanhope, daughter of Earl and Countess Stanhope. They were attired in dresses made in the style of Louis XVI. period, and composed of white Sicilian, with long waistcoats richly embroidered in white silk, and ruffles of old lace, white silk hats of the same period, trimmed with marabou-feathers and embroidery. Each of the bridesmaids wore a gold pendant with monogram in rubies and diamonds, the gift of the bridegroom.

At the breakfast which followed "the health and happiness of the Earl and Countess of Rosebery, whose marriage they had met to celebrate," was proposed in a few felicitious sentences by the Prince of Wales; and Lord Rosebery briefly returned thanks for his wife and himself. The breakfast was given at the bride's house in Piccadilly, and Lord and Lady Rosebery left town in the course of the afternoon for Petworth, Lord Leconfield's seat in Sussex.

A list and description of the presents occupied over a column of *The Morning Post* the next day. The presents, which included the Rosebery family jewels, had been, at the suggestion of the bride, surrounded by thousands of tea-scented roses. The effect produced was described as being as beautiful as it was novel. The Earl's presents to his wife, in addition to the Rosebery family jewels, consisted of an ancient parure—

namely, a wreath of jasmine and leaves, coronet and comb, earrings of large drop diamonds, and a necklace of single stones with a large Maltese cross pendant; the parure, made expressly for the occasion, was entirely of brilliants, and consisted of a lustrous court diadem, with some unusually large stones; a bracelet of Queen Mary of Scots design, and another of three simple rows of single brilliants; a necklace of three rows of brilliants with large rosettes or clusters, and a pair of earrings *en suite*; a pearl necklace of five rows, of large size, roundness, and orient; a large bouquet or stomacher of roses and rosebuds in diamonds, and four hoop-rings of rubies, emeralds, diamonds, and sapphires; a bracelet, brooch, and earrings of large pearls relieved by diamonds; a neck-jewel of rare sapphire; a jewelled fan and *bonbonnière* of Marie Antoinette period, and a mirror and two large candlesticks of old Venetian work. These presents, as set out for the guests to see, were divided by banks of lycopodium, dotted with gardenias.

A pleasing feature of the numerous presents was the many that came from tenants and others, indicating the popularity of both the bride and bridegroom. Among the bridal presents were those from Miss H. de Rothschild's tenants of Mentmore, who sent a large diamond pendant with a congratulatory address; the villagers of Cheddington sent her a pair of silver-gilt candlesticks,

also with an address ; from the villagers of Mentmore, Ledburn, and Crofton came a silver-gilt boudoir clock, with coronet, monogram, and roses and primroses ; the schoolchildren of Cheddington sent a gold pencil-case, with coronet, and set with forget-me-nots, accompanied by an address ; the Mentmore schoolmaster and pupil-teachers sent a silver inkstand ; from the inhabitants of Wingrave came an illuminated address signed by the Rev. T. Butts, the vicar, with an album containing views with the improvements effected by Miss H. de Rothschild in the village ; from the Hoggeston villagers came a pair of silver asparagus helpers ; from the Wingrave infant school a Dresden china toilet glass ; from the servants at Mentmore and Piccadilly a silver epergne with flowers, the base formed of primroses and rosebuds.

The Earl received from the Prince of Wales a dressing-case of Louis XVI. period of quaint design, the outer case being mounted with old silver-work. Amongst his other presents were : from his Scottish tenantry a silver bowl, rosewater dish, and a pair of tankards, the former piece of plate being relieved with chasings of battle pieces, etc., and the tankards being adorned with his armorial bearings and inscription, and accompanied by a congratulatory address wishing his lordship and his bride prosperity and happiness. Another portion of the tenants on the Scottish estates sent

the Earl an ormolu and Sevres china boudoir clock, also with a congratulatory address, the latter as a present to the bride ; the cottagers of Postwick sent a silver bracelet for the bride and a set of studs and links for the Earl, accompanied by an address. Lord Rosebery's servants sent him a silver travelling-lamp.

The officiating clergyman at the wedding ceremony was Prebendary Rogers, rector of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, prebendary of St. Paul's, and chaplain-in-ordinary to the Queen. Both the Earl and Countess were on terms of intimate friendship with him, and that friendship continued to the day of the death of the much-respected rector, who had been brought into close contact with Lord Rosebery in connection with many of the movements for the benefit of the artisans which have been referred to in association with the name of the Rev. Henry Solly. In the wedding ceremony Prebendary Rogers made no variations from the wording of the Church of England Service.

At the time of the wedding Lord Rosebery was thirty years of age and his wife twenty-six.

There were great doings in Scotland on the night of the wedding in celebration of the event. Lord Rosebery's tenants and other gentlemen dined together in the Douglas Hotel, Edinburgh, in the evening. Captain Tod, of Howden, occupied the chair, and Mr. George Gardiner, of Carrington Barns, and Mr. John Morrison were the croupiers.

212 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

The chairman, after the dinner, read the following interesting letter :

"2, BERKELEY SQUARE, W.

"March 19, 1878.

"MY DEAR MR. GLENDINNING,—

"I wish you to-morrow night to express the thanks of myself and one who will then be my wife for the beautiful gifts with which the tenants have honoured us. They have been greatly admired by all who have seen them, and gratefully appreciated by Hannah and myself.

"Those presents are only the last of a long series of tokens by which the tenants have shown my predecessor and myself their regard, which is hereditary I think, personal I hope, and mutual I know.

"I cannot believe that anything but the strengthening of those relations can result from the coming among you of a lady whose life has been spent in unselfish acts of mercy and beneficence, and who already, by anticipation, is fondly attached to her Scottish home.

"We shall both drink the healths of our Scottish friend to-morrow, and meanwhile believe me,

"Yours sincerely,

"ROSEBERY."

So warmly sympathetic a letter went straight to the hearts of the company, who after the

reading of the epistle immediately rose and drank a bumper to the health of the bride and bridegroom. The chairman, proposing the toast of their health, described the history of the Rothschild family. The Earl of Rosebery had, he said, been married that morning to a most accomplished young lady. The name of Rothschild had long been associated with great wealth and commercial influence. Wealth, when acquired through industry and honourable conduct, must always be regarded with respect. He proceeded to tell an interesting anecdote about the founder of the great banking-house. After the passage of the Rhine by the French, the whole of the minor princes of Germany were obliged to abandon their territories. Amongst those princes was the sovereign of Hesse-Cassel, who, after collecting his money and jewels, fled to Frankfort. At that time Frankfort was the home of the Rothschilds. They had a banking establishment there, and this Prince of Hesse-Cassel went to Meyer Rothschild, and after a great deal of trouble induced him to take charge of his jewels and his money. To do this at that time, when everything was in such a critical state, was to take a great responsibility. Immediately after the arrangement had been made the French entered Frankfort. The first thought of M. Rothschild was for the protection of the jewels committed to his care. He set to work and had them buried in his

garden. Scarcely had he accomplished his purpose when a party of French soldiers entered his house, robbed him of everything there, but, fortunately, they did not enter the garden, and did not discover the Prince's jewels. The whole of the citizens of Frankfort were reduced to poverty, and Meyer Rothschild was unable for some time to carry on his business. He was not, however, the man to allow a talent to lay long hid in the earth, and as soon as he found opportunity he made use of the hidden money, so that when peace was restored and the Prince was able to return, Rothschild gave him back not only his money and jewels, but 5 per cent. interest on their value for the time he had held them. The Prince of Hesse-Cassel was so much touched by this action that he offered to allow all the money to remain in Rothschild's hands, to help him with his business. The offer was declined; but, by the Prince's relation of the story at a Congress held later at Vienna, the potentates there assembled determined to give Rothschild their support, and this led to an enormous development of his business, and subsequently he was made a Baron of Austria.

One of the speakers at the dinner said "they all hoped that at some future time they should see the Earl holding a very important position in the kingdom of Great Britain." Another speaker—Mr. Glendinning—stated that he had

recently received a letter from Lord Rosebery in which it was mentioned that his lordship wished to have deferred the Countess's first visit to Dalmeny until the month of August, when the place would be in beauty, but that her ladyship was so anxious to see her new home, her new neighbours, her new friends, and her new country, that she desired to gratify that feeling by visiting Dalmeny as soon after her marriage as possible, so as to identify herself with the place.

On the Dalmeny estate, on the same day, flags were hoisted. About one o'clock in the day a telegram was received from Mr. Campbell, the clerk of works, announcing the completion of the marriage ceremony. The bell at the stables was then rung, and, the workmen having assembled in the riding-school, the telegram was read to them, and three cheers were given for the Earl and Countess. In the evening a great bonfire was lighted on the mansion hill behind the house, and formed the central feature of a great number of bonfires which were lighted in the neighbourhood. A firework display also took place. In Queensferry, also, there were special celebrations, including a lunch in the Council Chamber, attended by the Provost, magistrates, and Council. In response to a telegram, Lord Rosebery sent the following reply to Provost Borthwick :

" My wife and I are deeply gratified by the

sympathy and good wishes of neighbours we value so much as the Provost and Town Council of Queensferry."

The festivities at Dalmeny were resumed on the following day, when an entertainment was given to the servants and tradespeople connected with the estate. The gathering took place in the riding-school, and was attended by about three hundred persons. Mr. P. Glendinning presided at the dinner. He mentioned that the presents from them had been taken to the Earl by Mr. Peter M'Lagan. After the presentation, it was mentioned, the gentlemen present lunched with the Earl and Countess, "who made themselves very agreeable."

One of the speakers at this dinner—Mr. Chesser—in proposing "The memories of the late Lord Rosebery and the late Lord Dalmeny," took occasion to make the interesting prophecy "that the day would yet come when Lord Beaconsfield would have to make way for Lord Rosebery as Prime Minister." Lord Rosebery, he added, they all knew, inherited that kindliness of spirit and that disinterestedness of action which had always been the ruling characteristic of the Dalmeny family. Several of the workmen on the estate testified to the excellence of Lord Rosebery as a master.

Lady Rosebery, as had been intimated in the letter from Lord Rosebery which has been quoted,

paid a visit for a few days to Dalmeny shortly after the marriage ; but the visit was of a strictly private character, the home-coming festivities being, at the wish of the Earl and Countess, deferred until August, when they came with the grouse. Edinburgh was reached on August 5, and a hearty welcome was given by a great crowd which had gathered at Waverley station. Three day afterwards Dalmeny was devoted to rejoicing, the whole of the tenantry and tradespeople giving themselves up to the work of welcome. The special feature of the celebration was a grand dinner, followed by a ball. A great pavilion was erected within the grounds of Dalmeny Park. The site chosen was the picturesque terraced lawn south of the ivy-clad ruin of Barnbogle Castle, which commands one of the finest views of the Firth of Forth. At the back of a cross table at the north end of the hall, where Lord and Lady Rosebery and their immediate friends sat, were emblazoned the Rosebery arms, surmounted by a scroll bearing the motto, "Long Life and Happiness." At the south end on either side were oval shields bearing the monograms of the Earl and Countess. Lord Rosebery presided at the dinner, at which about two hundred and fifty were present. As the Countess of Rosebery entered the hall she was presented with a beautiful bouquet by Bailie Methven, of Edinburgh ; and when the noble

host and hostess took their seats a band played Mendelssohn's *Wedding March*.

Lord Rosebery, as chairman, proposed the loyal and patriotic toasts. He found some difficulty in dealing with that of "The Navy, Army, and Reserve Forces," and also avoiding politics, because "if they spoke of the Navy, they had only got to say they had passed through the Dardanelles; if they spoke of the Army, they had to remember that the Indian army had been transported to Malta; and if they spoke of the Reserve Forces, they had to recollect that they had been called out. . . . But he would only say that he hoped the Navy might always remain the most powerful navy in the world, because they were likely to have need of it; and of the Army, that he trusted it might remain the most efficient of its size in the world, and that it might remain the smallest maintained by any great Power. Of the Reserve Forces he would only say, that he hoped they might not have occasion to be called out again; but this they all knew, that if they were called out again, they would behave as nobly in forsaking their occupations and employments as they had done on a recent occasion."

Lord Rosebery next gave the toast of "The Tenantry on the Rosebery estates." In the course of his speech he dealt with agricultural questions, and thanked God they had no agrarian

crime in Scotland. He added: "The long and blameless married life carried on by the late Lord Rosebery and by the Dowager Lady Rosebery on these estates makes my wife and myself feel that we have indeed a hard task before us to succeed. We can only endeavour to prove ourselves not wholly unworthy of the relations with the tenantry of those dear ones who were our predecessors; but if at the end of our lives, whenever that may come, you may be willing to say we were not unworthy of them or of the cordial feelings which you have always displayed to us, we shall feel we have met with our amplest reward."

The toast was responded to by Mr. Grahame, of Bankhead, the son of the oldest tenant on the estate. He spoke of the "live and let live" principle on which the Rosebery estates were managed.

An eloquent speech was made by Lord Young in proposing "The health of the Earl and Countess." Towards the conclusion of his remarks he related how "it was very recently my happiness to be her (Lady Rosebery's) guest at her own beautiful home at Mentmore. You have all heard, I dare say, or most of you, of the magnificence of Mentmore, and you may receive my testimony that on this occasion report has not exaggerated; but pray receive my testimony with this addition: that the splendours of Lady Rosebery's home,

like the setting of a jewel, however rich and rare and beautiful the setting, pales before the lustre of the gem within, and were subdued even to my unaccustomed eyes by the charm of the gentle manners, of the noble mind, and of the graceful and winning kindness through which the heart must spring kindly back. My noble friend will permit me in his presence to say so much—that he has given earnest promise and raised expectations with respect to his not remote future which it will require all his ability and energy to fulfil; and he will allow me to express the hope and conviction that in achieving those high distinctions which are within his reach—though I am persuaded he covets them chiefly or wholly because of the opportunities of being useful to his countrymen, which, being achieved, they will give him—he will find no such monitor, whether to impel or to restrain him, no such helpmeet, as his wife.”

Lord Rosebery in the course of his reply said:

“ You have this afternoon conferred a nationality. My wife, as you know, is a Jewess by race, an Englishwoman by birth, and to-day, by adoption, you have made her a Scotswoman.”

Mr. Peter M'Lagan, M.P., remarked that “ Lady Rosebery succeeded to a princely fortune early in life, and spent it in such a manner as to elicit the encomiums of all among whom she lived. She had erected schools, built reading-rooms for the working people, and furnished them with

magazines, books, and newspapers, and she had set aside grounds for recreation. He trusted that if she carried out the same benevolent intentions in this neighbourhood they would re-echo the words 'God bless her,' and that Lady Rosebery would be received by all in the county as one worthy of the noble Lord whom they esteemed so much."

Immediately after the dinner the ball began. The ladies and gentlemen ranged themselves in two open lines, and the Earl and Countess walked up and down the pretty, animated avenues amid the plaudits of the guests. The ball was opened by a quadrille, in which Lord Rosebery had for his partner Mrs. Peter Glendinning, and the factor, Mr. Glendinning, had the Countess as his *vis-à-vis*.

Dancing was kept up from nine o'clock till midnight, and then the home-coming celebration ended.

Lord Rosebery spent a very busy autumn in the year of his marriage. He attended numerous meetings and went through an exciting election. A new School of Science and Art was opened at Falkirk on September 21, 1878. Lord Rosebery delivered the inaugural address from the pulpit of a neighbouring church, the hall of the building being too small for the audience. He raised a laugh at the outset by expressing his 'sense of the disadvantage under which he

laboured, being called upon, as he was, for the first time to "wag his pow in a pulpit." He welcomed the development of anxiety for information on science and art as one of the pleasantest signs of the times, and wished that every town of forty thousand inhabitants could have its public library and museum.

On October 18, 1878, he addressed a large meeting of Scottish Liberals at Aberdeen. His speech was devoted principally to a severe criticism of the policy pursued by the Government with reference to the Eastern Question. He was also present at the opening of the winter session of the Edinburgh Literary Institute on the evening of Wednesday, November 6, 1878. Lord Rosebery utilised the occasion to discuss the uses of such institutions, to point out "that the study of biographies tended towards the student forming an accurate appreciation of himself," and contended for "a patriotism which should seek the interest of the country apart from party considerations."

The meeting at Aberdeen and his attack upon the foreign policy of the Tory Government was of exceptional importance, for the days of the Tory Government might almost then have been said to be numbered, and Lord Rosebery had just been selected as the Liberal candidate for the Lord Rectorship of Aberdeen University. So the man who, being a peer, has been debarred from fighting, as he would have desired, for a

seat in the House of Commons was at any rate to go through an election which depended upon his personal popularity and the approval of his political views. At first Lord Aberdeen was selected to oppose him, but, as Lord Aberdeen insisted upon a non-party attitude, he was persuaded to withdraw, and in his stead Mr. Richard Cross was put up as Tory candidate. In these elections the language on both sides is usually strong and the candidates get hit as hard by the talkers as is possible. Lord Rosebery was bitterly attacked by a number of the speakers at the election; he beat Mr. (afterwards Lord) Cross by three votes.

Lord Rosebery's rectorial address was not delivered until two years afterwards. On that occasion—November 5, 1880—he spoke to the students in the Music Hall, Aberdeen, and a full report of the speech was given in *The Scotsman*.

Lord Rosebery said :

“What am I to say to you, gentlemen? That is a question which has constantly occurred to me. What is a young man to say to young men, unless he is more learned or more able than they are? He can give them neither advice nor experience; he has no right to be didactic, he can scarcely hope to be impressive. And yet, if there ever was a conception which might lend inspiration to dullards, it would be the idea of addressing a body of men burning with the generous sympathies of youth, strong with the robust qualities, both

mental and physical, of the Scottish race, standing under the shadow of an ancient University, upon the brink of that world in which they are so soon to plunge. They know some of the evils which beset life, yet they are not afraid to face them; they contemplate the future not with distrust, but with confidence; they are prepared for the responsibilities of manhood and the citizenship of a great Empire.

“Day by day the burden of that Empire waxes greater; day by day the responsibilities of manhood will become more onerous; day by day the future unveils itself before your eyes. And at this critical moment of your lives I find myself chosen as your Rector, and set to address you; chosen, I believe, as being, like you, a young Scotsman, though much older than yourselves, from sympathy rather than respect, from a sense of kinship rather than a hope of guidance.

“Let me express, in the first place, a heartfelt sense of gratitude to you for your confidence. It was a great honour to me when, two years ago, you chose me as your Rector; and though various unforeseen circumstances have prevented my coming among you to deliver the address which is the sign of inauguration, yet I have been able to take a humble part in the business of your University. But I can never forget, however slight my connection with you may be, that you called me, having no local connection

and being personally unknown, to this post, rendered illustrious not merely by its own importance and antiquity, but also by the reputation of my predecessors; and though I am conscious how inadequate I am to fill their place, yet I must always remain by your spontaneous action united in the bonds of affection and gratitude to the University of Aberdeen. I have spoken of the greatness, of the increasing greatness, of the Empire. A share of that Empire must devolve upon you; and I confess that it is in the spirit of that reflection that I consider with awe the assembly before me.

“The destinies of a nation are in the hands of its youth. How large a part of our destinies must lie in the hands of near seven hundred students, nurtured by the very fact of high culture in the proudest aspirations, gifted with that fervid spirit which is the distinction of our race, and endowed, I doubt not, as many of you are, with an intellect which is popularly supposed to possess some of the attributes of that granite soil on which you live!

“Do not mistake me, gentlemen. I do not mean that those before me are necessarily to sit in Parliament either in this country or in our colonies. The executive and legislative powers are only a part of the life of the nation. They both depend upon the character of the nation itself; and the nation must largely take that

character from its educated class, of which you will form, I trust, a powerful element. Whether you enter the Church, or whether you practise in law or in medicine,—whether you undertake the functions of guiding the mind of youth, or whether, without profession, you pass through life as honest and cultivated men, you, in virtue of the training you have received, must give a colour to the society in which you live. Gentlemen, I sometimes think, in relation to this question, that we are apt to forget what the functions of a University really are with regard to the nation.

“We hear a great deal of the various Faculties of new professorships, of the questions relating to scholarships and endowments; we have commissions and we have reports. But there are vital points lying outside the compass of this radius of educational investigation with which inquiry does not, and indeed cannot, deal. Are we not a little apt to disregard the camel in straining after the gnat, to consider culture and to forget character, to lose sight of the end in anxiety about the means?

“What, after all, is the object of University training, and indeed of all training? Is it not to produce a man,—a learned man, a cultivated man, a brilliant man, if you will; but, after all, and before all, a man, and an honest man? Now, of course, a University can only partially effect this purpose. Rousseau would tell you that

learning is itself the bane, and that a University is the worst place in the world to produce virtue. He tells you that erudition is the sign of decadence, and that lettered and cultivated nations have always succumbed to the rude heroism of barbarous tribes. Such a paradox is not worth considering. The Germans of this generation have completely demolished it, and I think the Scots themselves form a very ugly problem to a philosopher holding such ideas. But in the doctrine, however extravagant it may seem, there is a germ of truth. Learning is by no means everything.

“ By far the largest amount of training for manhood must be internal, must be undergone without help from teachers or from libraries. ‘In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often,’ in blood and iron is the destiny of man wrought out. ‘I was not swaddled, rocked, and dandled into a legislator,’ proudly exclaimed Burke; but is any one so swaddled and dandled? People may be rocked and dandled into insignificance, but they cannot be rocked and dandled into eminence. And this formation of character, this direction of energy, must be an internal process. I speak, of course, of secular means; for I would not casually introduce the religious aspect of the case into what I am going to say. It could not form merely a part, and therefore, rather than touch on it in a transitory manner, I deem it

more reverent to omit it altogether. But as regards the formation of character, the University is only an anxious, unconscious agent. She supplies rich and rare materials: not Solomon's temple was supplied in a more catholic and imperial spirit; but she can only sit by and watch whether the result be a shapeless block or the perfect figure of a noble man.

"You have before you now, gentlemen—you have within you, I would rather say—the clay and the marble, the chisel is in your hand, the dazzling models of antiquity are before you; every day that leaves the marble untouched is lost, each day may add a masterstroke to a masterpiece: can you not, then, understand how solemn and suggestive a thing it is for the Rector of your choice to address you at such a moment—the crisis of your lives? And it is no light matter, this choice of a Rector. It may not indeed be of such vital importance to yourselves as it was to your predecessors of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The crowd of students from all parts of the world, who recognised neither country nor language in the University, but regarded it simply as one of a harmonious sisterhood of such institutions spread over Europe by the Church for the preservation and promotion of learning, no longer need a Rector to watch over their interests. The nations into which they grouped themselves indeed exist, but no longer

include such varied races. Nor do you now require an official to protect you against ecclesiastical usurpation or baronial tyranny. In truth the Rector, as regards his original functions, might perhaps have followed his colleagues, the Censor and Ecnomus.

“ But as a matter of fact all University Commissions, however enlightened and however austere, have always respected and preserved the office of Rector, and, if I may say so, wisely respected and preserved it. For it is not only the means by which you connect yourselves with the government of the University, it is the means also by which you keep up your connection with the great world outside. From your ancient cloisters you look forth every three years and select candidates, whose merits you sift and discuss, partly as persons with whom you sympathise or whom you admire in the abstract, and partly as persons who, from local or accidental circumstances, may be useful to your University. Sometimes, indeed, the contest is almost purely political, and reflects the passions that are raging outside ; sometimes it is almost purely local, while sometimes it is neither ; and we may arrive at the quaint spectacle of Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Bright in apparent opposition and rivalry.

“ The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge give no such opportunities to their students, unless the demonstrations in the theatres on honorary

degree days may be deemed articulate expressions of opinion. But in Scotland we have Rectors, and I hope we shall continue to have them as an essential part of an ancient system, as a link between the students and the governing body, as a link between the University and the world. And perhaps, then, as your representative in the University Court, I may touch upon what appears to me to be a striking defect in your University system.

“I have said that the University offers you the noble models of antiquity for imitation. But I venture to deem it a flagrant omission that she hardly puts before you at all the giant and immediate shapes of modern and mediæval history. It is an omission from the threefold view in which the University may be regarded (for she wears, like the power which founded her, a triple crown); she is the custodian and repository of learning, she is the teacher of what can be taught, and, she has that third function of which I have spoken, which she can only partially and imperfectly fulfil, the formation of individual character. It is obvious, of course, that the partial omission at any rate of the study of modern history from the University in her capacity as a teacher, and as a repository of learning, is a grave defect.

“I would, therefore, rather deal with it as regards the formation of individual character, which I have spoken of as the most important while it is

the most indirect function of the University. For what, after all, is history? It is not merely that history records the life of nations, and that the life of nations and of men is much the same—the dark infancy, the aspiring youth, the stern realisation of manhood, the fruition or barrenness of maturity, and perhaps also the decay of old age—but that it is the story of human effort, the treasure-house of human biography, and therefore of noble models and of splendid inspiration.

“When we peruse the life of a great man, it is common to find that his favourite reading was Plutarch’s *Lives*, and yet from how small a range could Plutarch choose his subjects compared to that which history can now present before us! He only painted on a few inches of an immeasurable canvas, he only plucked a branch from a primeval forest. Against history as a scientific study, or indeed as a recreation, something may well be said. ‘Read me anything but history,’ said Sir Robert Walpole, ‘for that must be false.’ And indeed it is doubtful if history can even remotely approach accuracy. We know every day of numberless reports which circulate as true, and which remain uncontradicted, and which must of necessity remain uncontradicted, unless men would spend their lives in negation. There is no village too small to afford proofs that exact record is almost impossible, partly from the inherent carelessness of gossip, partly from deliberate falsification, partly

232 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

from the unconscious colouring that an individual mind will give to meagre facts.

"While history, up to the sixteenth century, suffers from scarcity of evidence, the history of our own times will suffer much more from a suspicious amplitude of material; the years of plenty will be worse than the years of famine. And, taking this gloomy view, it would appear that to urge the claims of history, when we are unable to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion about personages so well known as Queen Elizabeth, or George III., or the first Napoleon, is a futile and, indeed, a sarcastic effort. I speak, of course, of single-minded search after truth. I am not thinking of those ingenious writers who love to decorate some great criminal with padded virtues, and can, therefore, invest their narratives with all the charm of imagination and paradox. Nor, on the other hand, do I wish to allude to that other class, the body-snatchers of history, who dig up dead reputations for malignant dissection. But however earnestly it may be pursued, historical truth is difficult to secure. Like a wayward vein of precious metal, it sometimes abounds on the surface, and sometimes shifts in sands, and again will bury itself in the heart of the hills.

"Take, for example, two prominent persons in Scottish history. You could hardly find two men whose names are more familiar to those who have learned their alphabet than Macbeth,

the henpecked murderer, and Rizzio, the soft Italian victim of Scottish pride and Scottish jealousy. We know that Rizzio was slain, and, indeed, on payment of a small fee, you may see his blood on the floor. We believe him to have expiated in this way the dangerous fascination which he exercised over a beautiful woman. But we have no means of ascertaining his fascinations or even his age, and probability points to his having been extremely old as well as extremely ugly. Macbeth, again, has been presented to us by Shakespeare as a turbulent and unscrupulous villain. It would not be possible now to paint over what has been portrayed by supreme genius but all our historians appear to agree in this, that the reign of Macbeth was a period of unexampled peace, prosperity, and justice.

“In fact, if we wished to hold up for singular admiration a Scottish monarch, it would be difficult to prefer any to the man whose hapless fate it has been to be handed down to splendid immortality as a great historical criminal. But, indeed, admitting that history is inaccurate, it does not follow that it is useless for our purpose. I would go further, and say that for our purpose the accuracy of history does not signify. What we want is the bold colouring of character and the grand march of events. Whether Macbeth was really a scoundrel or not does not matter. If he had descendants, it might be important

to them to vindicate his memory. For us he points a moral and adorns a tale. We see the gradual march of guilt, the uneasy success following crime, and the tragedy of complete retribution. We want events to guide us and characters to warn us, but we do not require in events the exact detail of a Meissonier or a Blaremborghe, nor do we insist on the proper costume being placed on the actor so long as he plays his part.

“In spite of the objection to history on the score of inaccuracy, I humbly conceive that a University is unable to perform its functions as regards the formation of character without a professorship of modern history. But there is an omission of part of modern history which, strange to say, is worse than the omission of the whole. For I cannot help regarding it as a stain not merely on this University, but on all our Scottish Universities, that there is no provision for the teaching of Scottish history.

“While history in general is valuable in the one sense in which I wish to attribute value to it on the present occasion, the history of our native country is not merely useful and interesting, but absolutely essential; and I confess that it seems to me the greatest of omissions that there is no provision for teaching it. We must not lay the fault on our founders; they were employed in making that history, and had no leisure to devote

to narrative or research. There is no great fault, indeed, to be attributed to any one, for during the last two centuries the Scots have had so much ground to make up, and have made up so much ground, that they can hardly be charged with sins of omission.

“ Nor do I wish to be misunderstood. I think there should be a Professorship of Scottish History in Scotland, but not as representing an essential school or faculty. I would rather have it like a professorship of Belles Lettres, which is, as it were, outside the academical course, but which provides lectures which all may well attend as a relaxation from that course ; or like the Chair of Gaelic which is about to be founded at Edinburgh, and which represents a patriotic determination not to let that die out which is intimately connected with the life of the country.

“ Mr. Froude, indeed, has eloquently sketched a more ambitious scheme—a scheme which would realise the most extended hopes. If it could be carried out it would renew and strengthen the connection between the youth and the traditions of Scotland. But I half fear lest there should not be space in the academical course for so complete a system. I suspect the history course at Oxford is followed by a more leisurely class than exists to any extent at the Scottish Universities. Still, we can only bow to the authority of that great historical master, while I feel that if

Mr. Froude's scheme could be adopted I should rejoice ; but in default of that, if we could only achieve a less ambitious professorship I should be content.

"The great point is that there should be a commencement, and that we should not be liable to the reproach of producing highly educated Scotsmen who know all about the Ephors and nothing about the Lords of the Articles. It is a truism to say that the knowledge of the history of one's native country is not merely an educational advantage, but a positive duty. We need not go so far as Buchanan or your first Principal Boëce, and evolve out of our inner consciousness eight centuries of imaginary reigns, with their proper kings and appropriate Dutch portraits in Holyrood, so that our records may be more complete and more ancient than those of our neighbours. But at the same time it does not seem desirable, to put it on the lowest grounds, that we should ignore what has occurred in former days, the long agony of the country's growth and establishment, and bound our historical survey with some date of modern politics such as the Disruption or the first Reform Bill.

"The history of Scotland is not a cold register of dates and treaties ; it stirs the blood like a trumpet ; no stranger can read it without emotion. But when we reflect that those who battled and endured (for the history of Scotland during four

centuries is little less than a long martyrdom) are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, when we consider that our qualities and defects as a race are the direct result of those circumstances, when we know that the country which has charms to attract the whole civilised world is but an empty scene to those who cannot people it from the past, when we observe how history is liable to repeat itself, and that, in dealing with Scotsmen, we must expect them to be made in the same mould as their predecessors, it seems one of those mistakes which are worse than crimes for a native of Scotland to ignore the history of his country.

“ If we were not natives of Scotland, we should still be hardly justified in neglecting its history. It is, in the first place, rich in bold personalities ; and, in the second place, it has certain special features which must attract the historical student, however versed he may be in the annals of other countries.

“ As it is my anxious wish to attract your notice to the history of Scotland, let me, as briefly as may be, call your attention to one or two of these singularities. Take for example this peculiarity, that Scotland, while she had a history, developed a striking character, but no material prosperity ; but from the moment she ceased to have a history, she developed a material prosperity so marvellous as completely to obliterate her

national character. Until the union of the Crowns the Scots nation were only known as a turbulent race of hardy heroes—poor indeed, but poor because they preferred poverty to dependence, and were willing to sacrifice their castles and their crops to prevent the invader having a home or subsistence on Scottish soil.

“All this is now forgotten. The qualities still exist, none can doubt it, just as the faculties for industry and economy existed when there was no opportunity for their exercise. But the ancient reputation has been overlaid for two centuries with the reproach of avarice and the stigma of self-seeking. And why is this? Because from the time of the corporate union, when, thank God, she ceased to have a history, this little rugged country made an advance in prosperity resembling the progress of some state in Western America, with free institutions planted on a virgin soil.

“Nor is this difficult of explanation. The very policy of Scotland required for the defence of the kingdom that its most fertile portion should be a desert incapable of yielding food to the invader. We hear much of the heroism of the Russians in burning Moscow. What then are we to say of the Scots? Why, for two centuries Scotland furnished a succession of burning Moscovs. What is now the garden of Scotland—nay, I might add, the garden of the United

Kingdom—was given up to devastation in order that the race might preserve its liberties and assert its independence.

“There is no nobler fact in any history. It was as if Italy had made Lombardy a desert in order to starve out the incursions of the northern nations. It was the sole chance that existed for the preservation of that freedom which was dearer to Scotland than all the wealth that the world could offer. It was not that the Scots did not appreciate the satisfaction of opulence. It has been a stereotyped sneer against them for two centuries that they care for little else. But it was because they cared for freedom more, and that freedom, weighed in the scales, counter-balanced every other consideration. When their independence and liberties were secured, when by the removal of their Sovereign to London they might hope to enjoy that civil and ecclesiastical freedom which was always in peril so long as they received the individual attention of Mary Stuart and her descendants, they settled down to repair the ravages of long centuries of agitation.

“More than thirty years did indeed pass without serious disturbance ; but at the first whisper of oppression, at the first raising of the mailed hand, at the first revelation of a plot against the security of what they had bled to secure, they did not weigh for a moment the quiet and well-

being they had earned against the sanctity of that Kirk which was the breath of their nostrils ; and when the king drew the sword, they without hesitation drew the sword also.

“ Nor was it merely the people of Scotland that rose in arms. From every region of Europe the Scots who had passed into foreign armies, from restlessness, or poverty, or ambition, flocked homewards to place their valour and experience at the service of their country. Scotsmen who had taken service with Mansfeld and had fought for the Winter Queen, trained pikemen from Holland and from Denmark, veterans who could show scars as others show medals won under the Lion of the North, all rallied under a banner nearer and dearer than any they had known. Scotland took the initiative and indicated the remedy to England. She began the great contest between the people and the Crown which changed the conditions of monarchy and deprived the king of his life. She, with her poverty-stricken half-million, showed the path to a wealthy population ten times as numerous.

“ Surely the history of a people so bold, so disinterested, and so united, is not without instruction to the outside world. The history of Scotland presents this original phenomenon, that the prevailing, constant, inextinguishable passion of the people was for liberty and independence, and that this was shown in an extraordinary

attachment to monarchy. And this was no paradox. To them the monarch was only a sign of independence, like the lost Stone of Destiny.

“We see this by the constant efforts to obtain the custody of his person, and at the same time by his total want of authority. Where the king was, there the Government would be; hence the constant kidnapping of the Sovereign. But the king was to be only the symbol and not the possessor of power; he had but the attributes of a living Great Seal. So that in fact the same passion for independence which made them insist on having a king for external purposes made them reduce him to a nullity within his dominions. He was to be a cheap pageant, decorating rather than controlling the march of events—much less than a constitutional sovereign, little more than a Venetian Doge.

“When the crimes of Mary Stuart and the defects and departure of her grotesque son had robbed Royalty of interest even as a symbol, we see all the love of independence and craving for some outward sign of it find its sign and centre in the Reformed Kirk. The ancient Roman Establishment in Scotland seems never to have had much hold upon the nation. Its energy in the collection of property, real and personal, attracted other feelings than sympathy. Its prelates were a luxurious and, if they be not

much maligned, a dissolute class. They were, moreover, aliens in training, and their education abroad left them little in common with their fellow-countrymen at home.

“When the virtuous part of the nation was scandalised at their corruption, and the worldlings were irritated by their pride and covetous of their power, it was not difficult to effect their overthrow. Let us in passing be just. Before that proud Church was hurled down in Scotland, she left a supreme gift, nobler than the abbeys she had reared and the wealth she had accumulated. In the fifteenth century, as if conscious that she was about to pass away from us, and as if anxious to leave behind her the memory of a benefaction for which her name should be, if not blessed, at least forgiven, she determined to throw open to the people at large the treasures of learning that she had preserved; she gave us the Universities. Founded in a catholic spirit, framed on liberal principles, open freely and ungrudgingly to all that thirsted for knowledge, these Universities—and not the least our *alma mater* who gathers us together in Aberdeen to-day—give the ancient Church of Scotland a valid claim on our gratitude.

“But whatever were her claims, she received no thanks in those days. She was the Church of the nobles; the Church that was to succeed her was to be the Church of the people. The

Reformers were no respecters of persons. Good Maister Jhone—as Knox is quaintly called—saw in his sovereign only an eminent and heinous sinner. His successor saw in James VI. only a suitable object for interminable exhortation and reproof. It is not too much to say that at the end of the sixteenth century the parish ministers of Edinburgh had more power than the king in Scotland.

“Whether this be so or not, they represented the national feelings and embodied the national aspirations. The king had gone south—so much the better for him; the king had become a name. The Kirk abided with them—so much the better for them—and remained a reality. The crimes of Mary Stuart coinciding with the Reformation in point of date, it was easy, putting spiritual considerations aside, to transfer whatever loyalty existed from the monarchy to the Kirk.

“The loyalty of Scotland to the Stuarts seems to have disappeared then and there. When the wretched Queen returned to Edinburgh after Carberry, she must have heard in the yells of the avenging crowd, she must have seen in the painted banners which recalled her crime, that the feeling which hailed her birth even amid the gloom of national disaster had vanished, and that while she had sealed her own destruction, she had also dealt a fatal blow at the monarchy she represented.

244 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

“ The Scots, indeed, took up arms for Charles II., but he was only to them a symbol of independence ; there was between him and them neither liking nor respect. And as for the rebellions on behalf of his unhappy nephew, it seems perfectly clear that these were planned and carried out entirely by the Highland chiefs for motives which were not shared in by the great mass of the nation.

“ Again, in most old States we have to deal with four factors—a monarchy, a church, an aristocracy, and the people. Surely the history of Scotland presents these four elements in a striking light. The king of Scots, without power or money or an army, was at once the most envied and the least enviable of monarchs, asserting his imperial independence abroad, and persecuted by his subjects at home ; the Church, lax and splendid, toppling over from the mere weight and canker of corruption, and giving way to a far more stringent form of ecclesiastical government, which, in spite of its austerity, was adored by the people ; the aristocracy, fierce, poor, and proud, which, by dissension, after the manner of the Kilkenny cats, had so weakened itself that at the time of the Union it had fallen, if not into contempt, at any rate into impotence ; and slumbering beneath all, the nation, revealing itself only now and then in wild Edinburgh mobs or in stern West-country Whigamore raids, reserving

itself, as it were, for its moment of power and supremacy.

“ These surely are strange elements out of which to develop a successful nation. But I have no time to dwell on that: my contention is merely that these are elements which at any rate deserve attention, not only from the historian or even from a Scotsman, but from the student of human nature and human progress. I have incidentally touched on the king and the Church. Let me explain in a very few sentences what I would say of the aristocracy and the people. The turbulence of the aristocracy, whose very repose was only a sort of groundswell, was probably caused by poverty and the ease by which, under a system of constant forfeitures, large estates could be acquired by successful agitation.

“ The estates so quickly acquired were not the less rapidly forfeited, it is true; but the losses of the gambler never prevent his seeking perpetual windfalls. And it was not until the great galleon of the Church lay helpless amid these active privateers, and the acquisitions from an adversary so disabled assumed a semblance of security, that the nobles were content to settle down in peace upon their lands. As soon as dissension ceased, their influence terminated; for they required troubled waters to fish in. With a very few exceptions, such as the Huntlys, the Hamiltons, and the Argyles, the nobles in the

seventeenth century exercised influence only as the representatives or instruments of the Anglicised sovereign.

"Before the Union, if tradition lie not, at the end of each session, when privilege ceased, the Canongate Jail of Edinburgh was wont to be crowded with Scots peers. At that period the influence of the Duke of Hamilton, clouded and weakened by inherited irresolution, is the only independent aristocratic influence that we can trace; for the extravagant outburst of Belhaven was but the scarcely coherent expression, not of the feelings of the nobles, but of the passions of the populace. It may, therefore, fairly be said that at that time the nobles of Scotland had fallen into impotence; and, so far as leadership may be associated with the idea of the aristocracy, their place was taken by the Kirk.

"But where, meantime, was the people? There is nothing to my mind so extraordinary, in view of their energy and intelligence, as the obscurity in which the Commons of Scotland prepared themselves for the power they now enjoy. Now and then a sudden, silent, fierce outbreak betrayed the strength that was slumbering; such were the mobs which lynched Porteous, and insisted on the hanging of the captain of *The Worcester*. Indeed, the first appearance in history of the democracy of Scotland was, as we have seen, when, after the surrender of Carberry,

the captive Queen was greeted on her return to Edinburgh by the insults and execrations of a vast multitude bearing the ghastly effigy of her murdered husband. On that day the people first came forth to show that the robe of majesty should not shelter a great criminal; and it was surely a notable birth of public feeling.

“ But it is strange that these strong—nay, ferocious—instincts of justice and injustice should so seldom have flamed up, and that, while men sprung from the ranks of the people were obtaining education and distinction all over the Continent, the great mass should have preserved so stern a silence. From the surrender of Carberry to the time of the first Reform Bill, the genuine forcible expressions of public sentiment can be counted on the fingers, and yet these were sufficient to show that public feeling and public opinion were always in vigilant existence. We have, of course, in France an instance of a similar silent flood suddenly overflowing its banks at the Revolution, but it may fairly be urged that education among the masses in France, as compared with Scotland, did not exist.

“ In Scotland we see an energetic and intelligent population, ruled by a remote Government and a Parliament in which they were not represented, patiently tilling the soil and sending their children to the parish school till such a time as they

should be strong enough to demand a share in the control of their country's destiny. Such a spectacle, in these times of agitation and public meetings, is surely not without instruction; it is at any rate an original and perhaps a unique manifestation. I have touched on only a few of the distinctive features of Scottish history; and, indeed, the limits of discourse will hardly permit of more.

“But to those who study men more than events, our country's annals present no less attractions. The romance of history, indeed, is divided between two very different queens of France—Marie Antoinette and Mary Queen of Scots; while she assigns a prominent place to Charles Edward Stuart.

“Again, the history of revolutions is ever the most interesting, because it is always inseparably connected with some great man. The English had its Cromwell, the French its Napoleon, and the Scots its Knox. The student of human character will surely pause over the rugged features of Knox, ‘who never feared the face of man.’ He will lament the melancholy destiny that robbed Scotland at a singular crisis of Murray's precocious statesmanship. He will contemplate not without admiration the greatest and most sagacious of Scottish kings—James I., the Alfred of his country. He will be unable to view without a sense of personal affection the character of James V., the Scottish Henry IV.

There will pass before him the Bothwell of strange vicissitudes; and Carstairs, perhaps the greatest man that Scotland has produced outside literature; the sinister Morton, and the subtle Argyles; the Wallace and the Bruce, who are not sufficiently veiled in legend to be secluded from human sympathy and admiration; the learned Melville and the saintly Rutherford.

"Other names might be cited, but perhaps these will suffice; and indeed it is time that I should end. But let me point out one more inducement to the study I advocate. You are in the city perhaps most calculated to give an interest to the study of those times, for surely no place ever suffered so much for its prominence. From the time that the Covenanted Commissioners refused to drink the cup of *Bon Accord*, and were followed by Montrose with an army which slaughtered the dogs which had been made the innocent instruments of satire, this unhappy city was compelled to undergo as many outward changes of compliance as the Vicar of Bray or Bobbing John of Mar. Indeed, Aberdeen had been so often visited by Montrose, and in such various characters, that the authorities must have found it difficult to ascertain in what capacity they were to receive him.

"In those days the greatest seat of learning in Scotland, it was the fate of Aberdeen, as of Leipsic, to learn that a famous and hospitable

University is no protection against siege or outrage; while your well-sacked city, surviving the successive onslaughts of Malignants and Covenanters and impartial Highlanders, remains a noble monument of the stirring and perilous past of our country. But, gentlemen, I do not wish to weary, but to attract you, if possible, to the close study of Scottish history. I have thought that by so doing I could, without presumption or didactic affectation, best fulfil the duty imposed upon me.

“You are the best judges how far such a pursuit would suit your manifold dispositions. Around you learning spreads her various wares; you have but to pick and choose. You are the generation that holds for the present the succession to the long roll of famous men who have adorned this University. They have handed to you the light; it is for you to transmit it. The vestal lamp of knowledge may flicker, but it never dies; even in the darkest hours of dormant civilisation it found loving hands to cherish and to tend it. To you that lamp has been given by those who have watched over it in these ancient colleges. I hope and believe it will not wax duller in your hands, but rather that you will show forth its radiance in whatever part of the world you may be called upon to wield that influence which every educated man must exercise.

“And, gentlemen, how solemn a moment is

that passing forth from the cloisters of learning into the great Vanity Fair of the world, there to take, for good or for evil, the choice of Hercules and abide by the result! Even I may, without presumption, indicate to you the crucial importance of that crisis of your lives, when it lies with you to decide whether your career shall be a heritage of woe or a fruitful blessing and an honoured memory.

“Day by day the horizon of human possibility, which now lies so unbounded before you, must contract; the time must come when, under the stroke of illness or the decay of nature, hope and health, the pride and power of life and intellect, which now seem so inseparable from your triumphant youth, will have passed away. There will then be no surer consolation, humanly speaking, than the consciousness of honest hope fulfilled, of health not abused, of life and intellect exerted in all its strength and fulness, not like water poured upon the sand, but for the raising and bettering in some degree of some portion of your fellow-men.

“I would fain hope that this living mass of generous youth before me was animated by no less a hope, by no lower an inspiration, and that in coming years it will be my pride and privilege to hear of some of you at any rate receiving the merited praises of grateful mankind. And if I might address your venerable University, which

has conferred so gracious and so undeserved an honour upon me, I would say, in the words with which the Psalmist hailed the sacred city, 'They shall prosper that love thee'; that love thee aright, that love thee not merely as an end, but also as a means, as the blessed link with splendid traditions and with noble men, as the faithful guide and the unfailing friend."

In the evening Lord Rosebery was privately entertained to dinner in the Palace Hotel by the senators, Principal Pirie being in the chair. The students paraded the town after the delivery of the address, and there was a torchlight procession at night. Lord Rosebery had before the address to the students presided over a meeting of the Aberdeen University Court.

Lord Rosebery was not content to be a mere titular Lord Rector. He took a deep and active interest in the work of the University Court, and his rectorial address on the subject of Modern Scottish History, and especially the proposed Chair of Modern History, attracted widespread attention, numerous leader-writers of the day heartily supporting his proposal.

On the day after this address was delivered at Aberdeen, Lord Rosebery was elected Lord Rector of Edinburgh University, beating Sir Robert Christison by thirty-nine votes. There was again an interval of two years from the date of his election to the delivery of the rectorial

address. This was given on November 4, 1882. The students had a merry time beforehand. Peas were freely thrown about, and in this way the glass of one of the large lamps at the entrance-gate was broken. The new Professor of Greek, Professor Butcher, in response to a cry of "Let's give him a squeeze!" had a bad time. There was a great uproar in the hall. Crackers and peas were everywhere, even being shot amongst the ladies, who, on this occasion, included the Countess of Rosebery. When the Earl came into the hall something like quietude was restored, a hearty reception was given him, and he was accorded something approaching a peaceful hearing—for a student audience.

Lord Rosebery said :

"I am here to-day, gentlemen, to thank you for electing me Rector of your University, and therefore this is a proud, though embarrassing, occasion for me. I cannot pretend, and I shall not attempt to express all I feel. At such a moment I should be unworthy of your choice were I not the proudest and the humblest of mankind. The position of Lord Rector of this University is one to which the greatest of our fellow-countrymen have aspired. That you should have chosen me to fill it, therefore, may well exalt me, while, on the other hand, visions of who my predecessors have been, of the grave responsibilities and greater possibilities of the office, of the splendid opportunity

and the necessary shortcoming, may well come crowding over me, and cause my voice, nay, my knees, to fail me as I address this most impressive assembly.

“It would have been a high honour for me to have been elected thirty years hence, when I might at least have had the claims of age and experience. But I was younger than your Rectors usually are; I was already the Rector of another University; I had neither learning nor reputation to recommend me: yet you chose me in preference to one full of years and honours and academical service and European reputation. Moreover, we know that it is rare for any one to be a prophet in his own country; but I had the good fortune to be selected for distinction in the University of the capital, of which I am a citizen in sympathy and a near neighbour in fact. You can well understand that all these facts fill me at this moment with a pride which is nearly akin to the deepest humility.

“When I say that I am proud of being chosen your Rector you well know that it is from no sense of merit; and that I am free from the insanity of putting myself in any comparison, however remote, with Sir Robert Christison. None can say what it is at the moment that sways the fancy of youth: it may be political feeling; it may be a passing freak; it may be that that passion for something new which moved the Athenians of old has its influence in our modern Athens too. I, at any

rate, am too grateful and too satisfied to inquire. But there was one feature of that rectorial election which distinguished it among the three similar elections which were held that year. Both your candidates were Scotsmen—and, indeed, I cannot doubt that I owe my selection to my nationality alone; while in the other contests there was but one single Scottish candidate.

“I do not think that your action was taken on the mere cry of ‘Scotland for the Scots,’ for that seems to me but a narrow feeling at best: a similar cry was the mainspring of a party in America which called itself, or was called, significantly enough, the ‘Know-nothings,’ and which has now disappeared; while it may be remembered that if other countries were to take reciprocal action, no nation, I am proud to say, would suffer as much as this. I suppose that you wished for a resident Rector, and chose your candidates accordingly. But all the same, that event set me thinking of what is patriotism, of its adaptability to our times and our circumstances, of its necessary limitations, of its real nature and force and utility; and it struck me that I could choose no more useful topic for my inaugural address, whenever it should be required of me.

“That moment of trial has at last arrived, and I now offer you a few observations on the subject I have mentioned. Few and feeble I fear you will think them; but the matter is large, and

my opportunities for putting them together have been rare and occasional.

“In the first place, allow me to remark that there is no word so prostituted as patriotism. It is part of the base coinage of controversy. Every Government fails in it, and every Opposition glows with it. It dictates silence and speech, action and inaction, interference and abstention, with unvarying force and facility. It smiles impartially on the acceptance and the resignation of office; it impels people to enter and to quit public life with equal reason and equal precipitation. It urges to heroism, to self-sacrifice, to assassination, and to incendiarism. It rebuilt Jerusalem and burned Moscow. It stabbed Marat, and put his bones in the Pantheon. It was the watchword of the Reign of Terror and the motto of the guillotine. It raises statues to the people whom it lodges in dungeons. It patronises almost every crime and every virtue in history. The freaks to which this unhappy word is subject, the company and costume in which it finds itself, the crime, volubility, and virtue which it inspires deserve a separate history.

“But I am not here to record its vicissitudes. I will only offer a definition to serve my purpose to-day. Patriotism is the self-respect of race. It is a motive, or passion if you will, which has animated the noblest efforts and inspired supreme heroism. As regards our common allegiance to

the Empire, little need be said : it is the breath of our nostrils. If I were to descant on it there would be a general feeling that I might as well discourse on the old inspiring theme of *Virtus est bona res*. The patriotism I would speak of is more restricted in area, more limited in scope, but hardly less useful or less respectable : I mean the feeling of affection towards a nationality which is absorbed with others under a common government.

“ The tendency of the age is to the agglomeration of races with a powerful centre, just as villages used to be built round castles ; but it is on condition of respecting the various component elements. Now, it is difficult in some circumstances to unite with perfect compatibility the feeling for the nationality with loyalty to the centre. There is no such difficulty in Scotland. But the question is interesting how far the separate nationality may be asserted without danger to the common bond. That is a question too wide for me to discuss thoroughly to-day in all its bearings. Still, I may lay before you a few considerations which make me think it well that the sentiment of race should exist, and should exist vigorously ; and I shall point out some of the ways in which it may be usefully exerted.

“ The feeling in Scotland seems sometimes unexpectedly fierce and sometimes unexpectedly dormant. I do not know that it is in any danger

of extinction. It is probably more subject to misapplication; but it is liable to a serious and very natural decay, for it is apt to be considered as a rare specimen or an antiquarian relic: as Etruscan pottery or a toad in marble. Such a view, though not opposed to its existence, is fatal to its vitality: for it may be preserved as a mummy for centuries after it has ceased to have a vestige of life.

“I desire to-day not so much to extol its abstract virtue as its practical usefulness, which on consideration is hardly less obvious than its natural limit; and I shall deal more especially with the case of Scotland—firstly, because it is the case of which I am least ignorant; secondly, because I think that in England the sentiment of this lesser or particular patriotism, if I may so call it, is less fully developed, while in the case of Ireland the ground is so dangerous with

ignes

Suppositos cineri doloso,

that I may well be excused if I am unwilling to venture upon it.

“In England I think this separate sentiment is weaker than with us, for her wealth, her power, and her population make her feel herself to be Great Britain, with Ireland and Scotland as lesser gems in her diadem. Therefore, with an Englishman, the love of Great Britain means the love of England—the larger and lesser patriotisms are

one. He speaks, for instance, of the English Government and the English army, without condescending to the terms British and Great Britain—not from heedlessness, but from self-concentration.

“Where the distinct English feeling shows itself is chiefly in an impatience, if I may so call it, of Scotsmen and Irishmen; perhaps not an unnatural emotion, but not one on which I propose to comment. When an Englishman conducts the government of a country, he at once concludes that it becomes English; the thinnest varnish of English law and English method makes it English to his eye. He is satisfied. Every part of the United Kingdom must be English because it is a part of the United Kingdom.

“Now and then, indeed, some political development excites a passing doubt, but he either spurns the doubt or relegates the country which has caused it to the indolent category of the incomprehensible. It is a noble self-possession, characteristic of dominant races, without which England would not be what she is; but it is a dangerous guide. Where nations do not readily blend, their characters and humours must be studied. It is open to argument whether it is better that they should blend or not.

“But I wish to lay before you certain reasons why I believe it to be better that, where the national type is of a self-sufficing character, they

should not blend. In the first place, we may assert with confidence that a race, however striking and distinguished, is none the worse for being varied. Nay, if the whole world were peopled by a single race, however perfect, life would lose much of its interest and charm. And we, as patriots, although we must wish all the races of the Empire to possess certain qualities, cannot desire uniformity, any more than we can wish that all our manufacturers should engage in the same industry or all our men of intellect in the same branch of inquiry. A great Empire like the British should be a sheet knit at the four corners, containing all manner of men, fitted for their separate climates and work and spheres of action, but honouring the common vessel which contains them ; not like that massive glacier-mill, the Roman State, which rounded off the resisting bodies within it to a monotonous form, while it crushed and annihilated the weaker. I will take, as an example of what I mean, the most compact aggregation of States which has been recently effected—I mean the kingdom of Italy. There have been amalgamated within the last quarter of a century Rome, Naples, Piedmont, Tuscany, Sicily, Lombardy, Genoa, Venice, Parma, Lucca, and Modena, each of which was formerly a State boasting a separate and distinguished existence. When the repression that had weighed on them was removed, their

vitality was found fresh and unimpaired, as vegetation thrives under the shelter of snow, and bursts forth on a thaw.

“ But this life was distinct and different in its various forms. They are now one, not possibly without occasional discontent and some secret jealousy, but in the eyes of Europe one and indivisible. The advantages of a united government, the strength, the economy, the pride of life, are apparent. But would it not be too high a price to pay for even such a gain as this, that separate countries should become provinces in name as well as in fact, that these separate types should be effaced, and that nothing but a difference of physical appearance should be visible between Turin and Naples ?

“ I know well the danger to which we are exposed in speaking of Italy, for we are apt to take in some respects the point of view from which an American considers English matters. The American regards England as an ancestral garden and museum, in which he has a historical interest ; he is therefore rather conservative with respect to it, and views innovation here with much the same feelings as a landowner does a railroad projecting through his park. In the same way we regard Italy as the pleasance and gallery of the world, and are apt to consider the march of events there less as efforts of reform than as invasions of the picturesque.

"Well, but I would urge that, for the sake of Italy herself, it is better to keep up the rich rivalry of great cities, which can borrow from each other's abundance of character and idea without losing the mould in which it casts its own citizens. I take Italy, then, to illustrate the contention that in an empire obliteration is not harmony, nor monotony union; that if a race has ever been a separate civilised nation, it must still contain the qualities which made it so, which are therefore valuable, and part of the common stock of mankind; and that a government or a ruler who neglects or wars against these principles is not merely sinning against national life, but is wasting a source of power as clearly as a general who spikes his guns, or an admiral who scuttles his ships.

"There is a stronger case—the case of Austria. It would be too long to work out in detail, and, indeed, it might carry me beyond my point. But was Hungary ever a source of strength to Austria till she was recognised as Hungary, and treated as Hungary, and not as an Austrian province?

"Take the case of Poland. Russia has attempted the obliteration of Poland in that part of Poland which belongs to her; Austria has recognised and respected the nationality of Poland in her part. What is the result? Poland, in spite of Russia, is as Polish as ever; but in Austria she is loyal, and in Russia she is not. These are extreme instances, I know. But from

these extreme instances, though they are not strictly analogous, we may at least derive this truth, that even in this practical nineteenth century patriotism and nationality have to be considered and respected. I almost hear the question: '*Cui bono?*' We may be obliged to take this sentiment into consideration, but surely we were better without it. The English race is one of the noblest and most powerful, if not the noblest and most powerful, in the world. Suppose England had effaced your race, as the ancient Picts were effaced, and colonised the country with her own people, would Scotland have lost much, or the world in general?' To which I reply, that not merely Scotland, but England and the world would have lost much. The noblest race, indeed, is a generous mixture of great races. Just as the Saxon, the Celt, the Dane, and the Norman blend in the Englishman of to-day, so the Moor, the Goth, and the Jew helped to make up that dominant type, the Spaniard of the sixteenth century.

"In the same way we may hold, without disparagement to the Englishman, that this island is the better for containing Englishmen and Scotsmen; that there is more variety, more depth, more stimulus, and more comparison. Have not, for instance, the educational successes of Scotland done much to stimulate educational enthusiasm in England?"

“While the lighter graces are denied to us, is there not a dour depth in Scottish character which the Southron may study with advantage? Would the fascination of visiting Scotland be as great if it were colonised with the inhabitants of Surrey and Middlesex? Was England any the worse for those bonny Highland regiments that sprang the first into the trenches of Tel-el-Kebir? Is it not possible that while what remnant of the Scots that escaped would have ceased to be Scotsmen, they might have made but indifferent Englishmen? Would Bloomfield have been a sufficient substitute for Burns? Would Scott have been a wizard in the South?

“This may be a sentimental view, and far below the cognisance of the philosopher; but sentiment has its power, and, like other gases, it requires cautious treatment. However, I acknowledge that, in a country like this, the patriotism of every-day life must have a practical basis as well as its sentimental colouring. It must supply a want; it must have a reason of existence; nay, it must have outward symbols to cling to.

“If it has not these, it is a mere hysterical platitude. But I contend that there is a very broad principle, and a principle of the highest importance in the preservation of a national character in a country like this. I used just now the expression ‘self-sufficing,’ and I used it deliberately. A country like ours has reached a

stage of development when government is really but a small matter compared with national character; and it is the respect for, and assertion of, national character that constitutes patriotism.

“Up to a certain point nations are apt to be largely influenced by their Governments, but after a certain point Governments are the mere outcome, the mere casual emanations, of the nation itself. The nation has the Government under its control; the Government is its servant, not its master; its destinies are shaped by causes independent of Government. A race that has long possessed its freedom and its free institutions wears them like easy clothes; they are indispensable, they allow the frame to act and the mind to work without hindrance, but they do not influence the operations of either.

“Take the history of a century or half a century in this country, and what may seem a paradox becomes at once a truism. In a century or half a century important changes take place in a country. You gaze on the face of a century as you gaze on the face of a region; you see great works and transformations, but it does not occur to you to ask who were the ministers by whom they were executed. These are the results, and that satisfies the mind; it is left to the professional historian to examine the details.

“But, indeed, how are the operations effected? By Government sometimes; but that is only

their last stage. The thinker produces the idea and casts it into the common good ; it often long lies lost. Presently some one lights upon it, and it reappears ; perhaps it may then vanish again and yet again, till at last it is produced at an opportune moment, and becomes the inspiration of the country. How many old spinsters of ideas have we suddenly seen developed into queenly brides ! I will not, of course, allude to political changes, though the same remark applies to them. Nor will I take such an example as our railway system, though that is a strong instance ; nor to our telegraphic system, though that is perhaps even stronger, as the State stepped in when that was an accomplished fact, and purchased it.

“ But take the general improvement in the dwellings of our labouring classes. That in the country has been caused by the progress of enlightened ideas within the nation. In the towns it has been largely caused by the gift and initiative of Mr. Peabody ; and when his scheme had been working for some time, Government took it up and gave legislative assistance. Take another movement which has passed all over England, and has raised enormous sums from unimpressible people, and without the stimulus of any special enthusiasm : I mean that for the restoration of churches, which was set on foot just half a century ago by a handful of enthusiasts.

“Probably nothing would impress an English Rip van Winkle more than this transformation, which has never even had any point of contact with the Government. Education, which is now considered almost as much a necessity as air and water, owes its present regulation, no doubt, to Government; but it would have lapsed in Scotland had it not been for the people, and it was only taken up in England long after it had been urged and publicly exemplified by individuals. But take the case of Scotland. I see that it is calculated that after the Union Scotland contributed only $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the Imperial revenue, while in 1866 it contributed $14\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and that during the same period, while the revenue of England increased 800 per cent., the revenue of Scotland increased 2,500 per cent. Was that owing to Government? Certainly not. During four-fifths of that time there was but little government in Scotland, and that little as bad as it well could be. The material progress of the country was owing to certain qualities in the Scottish race, which, on the lowest ground, I think these figures show that it would be a pity to let die.

“But I am content to put that aside for a moment, and I simply take it as an illustration of the fact that the material progress of a country is not necessarily dependent on government. I hold, then, that the changes that affect the mass of the nation proceed from the nation itself, that

the well-being of a free nation depends upon itself. I believe that at this moment the people of Great Britain are better, happier, and more prosperous than their European neighbours, and this mainly because their long enjoyment of self-government has enabled them to know what they want, and to obtain it. With a start of centuries they ought long to be able to preserve their pre-eminence.

“ It will be their own fault if they do not. With them the hand and the eye, as with consummate marksmen, are accustomed to act together. They are not precipitate in making up their minds. They allow every influence to operate. They suffer the picture of a possible future to be tested by practical experience and coloured by past tradition: they place it in every light before they allow it to inspire their conduct or to affect their destiny. They are willing to receive and consider all ideas: some they entertain, some they pass over with polite indifference; of some they adjourn the consideration; those that they accept they lose no time in adopting. If this is so in England, the case of Scotland is even stronger. Scotland has been accustomed to be left much to herself. Till Scott brought Scotland into fashion, the country was little known and less liked; and unless a Porteous riot or a young Pretender troubled the political atmosphere, England was only too glad to leave Scotland to herself.

“And it was well for Scotland that it was so. She attained her majority when other countries are still in their political teens. When others needed support and guidance, she stood alone. And in the future she should find the value of this. For in a country that is self-sufficing, that governs itself, every element of national life is of importance, not merely because the vitality and the character of a race are intimately connected, but because every part of the country requires to be self-reliant. Every part of the country requires to study and formulate its own wants and its own ideas before it can hope to get a hearing for them. Nay, every part of the country will have, it is easy to see, to be left more and more to its own methods and its own devices, for it is impossible that any central Atlas can be found to bear the burden. I remember that five years ago there were some figures published which were a waking nightmare. Mr. Hawksley then calculated that, taking a generation to be forty-two years, and starting from the present population, at the end of the first generation the population of England and Wales alone would be 44,808,000 ; at the end of the second, 83,656,000 ; at the end of the third, 156,000,000 ; at the end of the fourth, 291,000,000 ; at the end of the fifth, 544,000,000.

“What will happen two centuries hence, when the population will have reached that figure, we may safely leave to our five hundred millions of

descendants. But the growth of the population, vast as it is, means this at the present time : that it is well for the different divisions of the Empire to be able to take a little care of themselves, and not to hope for too much from the powers of beneficence in London. Well, then, my contention comes briefly to this, that it is good for the Empire that we should preserve our nationality, and that, as regards ourselves, we should find a use for it.

“ I pass by many kindred topics, such as the great value of the Scottish character as a colonising agency, because I fear to weary you, and because I wish to keep within the boundaries of Scotland. But how, for the purposes I have indicated, is this nationality to be preserved and utilised ? It is not evidently mere peculiarities of accent and costume which are meant ; it is not by a barren attachment to barren traditions ; it is not by insulating the country.

“ I have no time, indeed, to dwell minutely on so great a subject, but if I might offer the suggestion of what I mean, it would be, internally by development, and externally by emulation. As regards those who are not our fellow-countrymen, let us endeavour to prove ourselves ahead of them ; as regards ourselves, let us endeavour so to raise the standard of our institutions and our people that they may be the envy of mankind.

“I see no Utopian hope in this : I see nothing political : I see nothing in which the truest patriotism might not stimulate every individual of this nation in his own degree and sphere to engage. I see a work in which all might co-operate, an edifice where all might build or help the builders. Let the Scottish ploughman make it clear that he is better than the ploughman of other countries : the Scottish milkmaid prove that she is a better milkmaid : the Scottish housewife neater than other housewives : the labour of the day-labourer more valuable than that of other day-labourers : the fisherman and mechanic more expert than other fishermen and mechanics : and all these will be engaged in a work which will raise their country and will find an immediate reward.

“If I take these humbler and manual avocations, it is to strengthen my argument. It is not apparent, at first sight, how an ordinary labourer can raise the reputation of his country. But it is none the less true, and I will give you an instance. Scotland seems to supply the world with gardeners.

“Now I venture to say that this fact raises the reputation of Scotland. I further think that the association of Scotland with that gentle and beautiful calling has done much to lessen the prejudice against our country. I think the engineers of great steamboats are usually Scots. I speak with apprehension and under correction,

and therefore do not emphasise this statement, though I believe it to be a fact.

“But if gardeners and engineers can raise the reputation of Scotland, how much more, as we get higher in the scale of education and opportunity, may we expect to find Scotsmen adorning the name of their country. What will your chances be? I am not going to name to you the roll of famous Scottish divines, and statesmen, and lawyers, and physicians, who have been reared here like yourselves: the roll is long and time is limited. But I may at least say this: that your chances of making your country proud of you, and mankind proud of your country, are a thousandfold greater than those of the classes I have mentioned.

“Your truest patriotism, the truest of every Scotsman, is to be capable and reliable; wherever a Scotsman goes he is taken as the sample of his race: the best service, then, that he can do to his race is to approve himself a meritorious sample, and his merit will enhance the reputation of the stock. This is not the mere thesis, Be good and you will be happy. It is supplying another and a common stimulus to the energies of a nation which sometimes seems passionately to desire a means by which it can show its patriotism and its mindfulness of past achievement. We cannot omit, in considering the practical and practicable outlets for patriotism, the expenditure

of money. I need not speak of this in a generation which has seen the Baxters and the Bairds, the Coatses and the Carnegies, and not least my noble friend, your latest doctor, the Marquis of Bute. Great sums have been given and bequeathed for educational purposes, although the flood of private munificence to our Universities might perhaps have been even larger but for the fact of Government subsidies.

"But still as regards the patriotic bestowal of money, Scotland holds her own, and will, I doubt not, continue to hold her own. As an example of this and of the internal development, and of the righteous emulation which I advocate, there is the Royal Infirmary, the best equipped in the world, which now adorns this city. Scotland here leads the way: her success will incite other countries to build larger and better infirmaries, so that by this great work she will have benefited herself and society as well. Paisley receives almost annual benefactions from the princely family of Coats. Dunfermline has been adorned, I had almost said revived, by the affectionate bounty of one of her sons. Dundee has recently received a University. Edinburgh has lately been adorned with a cathedral; Glasgow with a public library and a college hall. I take these instances at random, for there are similar cases of frequent occurrence.

"There is another patriotic method of spending

money which I cannot omit in a seat of learning like this, and in which Scotsmen have also borne a distinguished part,—I mean by printing and illustrating documents and pieces bearing on the history or literature of their country. What with the book-printing clubs and the liberality of individuals, I suppose that few countries have a mass of national information and materials so fully set forth as Scotland.

“This may seem a minor matter, but, speaking in the strict nationalistic sense, it is not; for in this way you preserve your archives beyond the touch of time, and enrich the general treasure of human erudition. But besides the gifts of private benefaction, Scotland has a noble inheritance, of which we are the trustees. For on three external bases we retain the ancient symbols and facts of independence.

“Our systems of Religion, of Law, and of Education are all essentially and outwardly different from those which prevail in England. The Church and the Law we kept strenuously and purposely (and when I speak of the Church I mean, of course, the Presbyterian Churches, whether established or not); the Universities remained not by special effort, but because of their fitness for the work. The Presbyterian system and our scheme of jurisprudence would continue to exist even if they were much less efficient than they are because of what I may call the historical

conservatism of the Scottish people ; the Universities will continue, not merely because of their present powers and usefulness, but because of their constant readiness to adapt themselves to the shifting conditions of human requirement and intellectual effort. I plead, then, that over these three distinctive systems we should watch with peculiar care, with such constant anxiety both to preserve and to improve, both to maintain the spirit while accepting the suggestions of the teeming age, that those outside our boundaries shall recognise that it is their excellences and the sedulous anxiety with which every opportunity is taken of still further improving them, that divides them from other such systems,—not mere peculiarities and catchwords of form.

"Not that the people of Scotland have shown a blind love of form, even as regards these cherished institutions. Alterations are constantly made and demanded in the law ; the Courts have been the subject of constant modification ; changes have been effected in the ecclesiastical bodies ; the efficiency of the Universities is a subject of constant and vigilant scrutiny ; but there is no complaint so long as essentials are left untouched.

"When Norman Macleod went to visit an old woman who was both a Covenanter and a parishioner, she at once offered him the end of her ear-trumpet, and shouted, 'Gang ower the fundamentals!' and we may be certain that it

would be perilous for any statesman who was dealing with Scotland to tamper with the fundamentals. I spoke a moment ago of the historical conservatism of the Scottish people. Nowhere is that historical sentiment in its best and highest sense so strong. It is that which has preserved Scottish nationality, and it is that which will preserve those institutions in Scotland which are worth preserving. Nay, it is the practical determination to keep what it sees clearly is worth keeping, and to sweep away what is not worth keeping; its keen insight into what is valuable and essential, and its indifference to form and pretension, which not merely have preserved the Scottish character, but are the Scottish character.

"There was, it is true, a shriek of dismay from Scotland when she saw her Parliament disappear and her delegates proceed southwards to London. But a moment's reflection convinced her that the Parliament had not been so efficient as to demand many tears, or to preclude the possibility of imagining a better one on the banks of the Thames. Year by year during the last century she saw Edinburgh becoming less and less, and London more and more of a capital. In many countries it would have produced assimilation or obliteration. In Scotland it produced nothing of the sort. She had preserved her fundamentals. She retained her Church, her Law, and her Teaching.

"Besides these she had here traditions, and the

fierce energy required to fight soil, and climate, and poverty. She thus retained the resources and guarantees of her national character. I maintain, then, that both in its shrewd and in its sentimental aspects the Scottish character is well fitted to deal with its institutions, and to perfect them and itself. I have indicated that that is, in my humble opinion, the true direction for what is called patriotism in this nineteenth century.

“We must all, I contend, bear this in mind; it should be part of our mental training; it should inspire our Universities and all the influences that breathe on our youth. It should become a factor in the national life, and it should guide the enthusiasm which history evokes and meditation inflames. But I hear you ask, Why address this series of hints to us? I speak them to you, although they may not seem proper to the occasion or the audience of a University discourse, because I contend that they are not merely pertinent, but vital to the present audience. I speak them, too, knowing that you are by no means all Scots; but advisedly, as to those who should understand, and explain elsewhere, why we cling to our nationality, and who will, I hope, bear westwards and southwards that second and higher Scottish nature of adoption which Brougham, and Horner, and Lansdowne, and Russell took from their education here.

“Moreover, with this University and this city

of ours you will always have a sacred link. You 'will drag at each remove a lengthening,' but not, I trust, a painful chain, of which one end will be fixed in Edinburgh.

"Let me illustrate what I mean. In the last century a Scottish adventurer called Dow ran away to the East Indies, and took service and rose to high command under the Great Mogul. One day he was narrating how, when he had charge of that potentate, with two regiments under his command, at Delhi, he was tempted to dethrone the monarch and reign in his stead. Dr. Carlyle—Jupiter Carlyle—asked him what prevented him from yielding to that temptation; and he gave this memorable answer, that it was the reflecting on what his old schoolfellows at Dunbar would think of him for being guilty of such an action.

"And so I venture to predict that, long after you have quitted this University, its associations will hold and control you, and that you will often be spurred to good, and restrained from evil, by the thoughts of what your old class-mates in Edinburgh would think of you. These matters, therefore, cannot be indifferent to any of you; but to the Scotsmen in this hall they are vital, because on them, in the coming generation, it depends to preserve Scottish tradition and maintain Scottish character. Much of that character has been taken away from us by the swift amalga-

gamating power of railways, by the centralisation of Anglicising empire, by the compassionate sneer of the higher civilisation.

“ The present state of things soon passes into tradition, facts become fictions, the real and the unreal become blended in the haze of a decade. Much is passing away, much more must pass away ; and it is well. Your old draperies, your old tapestries, your old banners, are clutched by the greedy centuries, and carded and thrown into the mill, that they may emerge damp sheets for your newspapers ; and it is well. Your old bones are pulverised that they may dress the pastures ; and it is well. Your abbeys and your castles are quarries for dykes, and prize bothies, and locomotive sheds ; and it is well. Your archives cover preserves, your ancestral trees pave roads, you sound for coal under your old tower, and it tumbles about your ears, your clan emigrates to Glasgow or to Canada, the glen is silent save for the footfall of the deer ; and it is well. You scale the dark brow of the mighty Helvellyn, and you find a personally conducted tourist drinking bottled beer on the summit ; and it is well also.

“ The effigies and splendours of tradition are not meant to cramp the energies or the development of a vigorous and various nation. They are not meant to hold in mortmain the proper territory of human intelligence and righteous

aspiration. They live and teach their lessons in our annals, they have their own worshippers and their own shrines, but the earth is not theirs nor the fulness thereof.

“For all that, however, these very annals, and the characters they inspire and describe, are our intangible property; they constitute an inheritance we are not willing to see either squandered or demolished, for they are the title-deeds and heirlooms of our national existence. And so, gentlemen, I have ventured to consider with you to-day some of the tendencies and some of the limitations of what is called patriotism. In Scotland I think that spirit rather requires direction than sustenance. What we need is not the passive recollection of the past, though the past should never be forgotten; it is not the mere utterance of time-honoured shibboleths, though we need not disdain these either; it is not the constituting the plaid a wedding-garment without which none is welcome, though we may love the tartan well enough;—it was not thus that Scotland was made, nor is it thus that she can be maintained.

“The spirit that I will not say we need—for it exists, but the spirit that we wish to see developed is an intelligent pride in this country of ours, and an anxiety to make it in one way or another, by every means in our power, more and more worthy of our pride. Let us win in the competition of international well-being and

prosperity. Let us have a finer, better-educated, better-lodged, and better-nourished race than exists elsewhere ; better schools, better universities, better tribunals, ay, and better churches. In one phrase, let our standard be higher, not in the jargon of the Education Department, but in the acknowledgment of mankind. The standard of mankind is not so exalted but that a nobler can be imagined and attained.

The dream of him who loved Scotland best would lie not so much in the direction of antiquarian revival as in the hope that his country might be pointed out as one that in spite of rocks, and rigour, and poverty, could yet teach the world by precept and example, could lead the van and point the moral, where greater nations and fairer states had failed. Those who believe the Scots to be so eminently vain a race will say that already we are in our opinion the tenth legion of civilisation. Well, vanity is a centipede with corns on every foot : I will not tread where the ground is so dangerous. But if we are not foremost we may at any rate become so. Our fathers have declared unto us what was done in their days and in the old time before them : we know that we come of a strenuous stock.

“Do you remember the words that young Carlyle wrote to his brother nine years after he had left this University as a student, forty-three years before he returned as its Rector? ‘I say,

Jack, thou and I must never falter. Work, my boy, work unweariedly. I swear that all the thousand miseries of this hard fight, and ill-health, the most terrific of them all, shall never chain us down. By the river Styx, it shall not! Two fellows from a nameless spot in Annandale shall yet show the world the pluck that is in Carlyles.' Let that be your spirit to-day. You are citizens of no mean city, members of no common state, heirs of no supine empire. You will many of you exercise influence over your fellow-men: some will study and interpret our laws, and so become a power; others, again, will be in a position to solace and exalt, as destined to be doctors and clergymen, and so the physical and spiritual comforters of mankind. Make the best of these opportunities. Raise your country, raise your University, raise yourselves. Your light, if you show it forth, will not merely illustrate yourselves, but be reflected here.

"We, your elders, then, have at any rate a personal interest in observing your career; they, your teachers around me, I, your transient head, may well look forth with anxiety to see if the great wave of learned life that will roll from these walls into the world is to be an influence for good, or an influence for evil, or feebly dwindle into a stagnant puddle: we watch its curling crest without knowing where it will break or what it will effect: we can but mutely hope that it will neither wreck

nor strand the vessel of the State, but help to bear it safely on.

“The words of a moment or a speaker like the present can neither bear a lesson nor bequeath a memory. Were it otherwise, I should simply pray you to love your country ; to add this one ennobling motive to those other dead and living influences of the past, the present, and the future, which urge you on in the path of duty, which sustain you in the hour of trial, in the day of difficulty, in the very valley of the shadow of death.”

After the address the students heartily sang, “For he’s a jolly good fellow!” There was a torchlight procession in the evening, and the students thoroughly enjoyed themselves : they smashed street lamps and windows, engaged in a regular riot, got into conflict with the police, and some of them made the acquaintance of the police-court the next morning.

CHAPTER XI

PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN LORD ROSEBERY'S EARLY PARLIAMENTARY LIFE—
THE ELECTION OF 1868—GLADSTONE AND DISRAELI—IRISH CHURCH
DISESTABLISHMENT—CIVIL SERVICE REFORMS—THE ELECTION OF
1874—MR. GLADSTONE'S FIRST RETIREMENT—THE EASTERN
QUESTION—SPEECHES ON FOREIGN POLICY

LORD ROSEBERY, in the earlier years of his Parliamentary life, spoke seldom. He was a listener to and a student of the public questions to which his attention was necessarily drawn. It was in the year he succeeded to the title and entered the House of Lords that the general election came, the great contest of those great men, Gladstone and Disraeli. The result was a victory for the Liberal party, and Mr. Gladstone formed what Mr. F. W. Hirst in "The Life of William Ewart Gladstone," which Sir Wemyss Reid has edited, described as "the greatest Peace Ministry of modern times," for it "exhibited in its measures and its acts, in its legislation and its administration, a harmony, a unity, and an individuality which are never observed in collective bodies except when they are controlled by a master-hand and are subordinated to a master-mind."

Lord Rosebery had in the House of Peers seen the last days of the Conservative Government, and was a keen observer of the events which followed. Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country on three main questions—the history of the last Reform Act, Public Economy, and the Irish Question. The election address from Hawarden shows the attitude of the Liberals of the day towards the questions which at the time were dividing politicians and people. In that address, issued to the electors of South-West Lancashire, Mr. Gladstone said :

“ From you, the electors of the South-western Division of the County of Lancaster, I solicit a renewal of the trust which was confided to me in 1865, in a manner demanding from me peculiar gratitude, by the constituency of the entire Southern Division.

“ I then came before you as the advocate of a policy of trust in the people, tempered by prudence, and averse to violent and hasty change.

“ In the spirit of that profession, I was a party in 1866 to proposals for the extension of the franchise, which I thought the smallest that could meet the just claims of the unenfranchised classes, and which were studiously limited, in order if possible to disarm jealousy, prejudice, and fear.

“ We were met by an opposition, not indeed as direct, but yet as persevering and detrimental, as was ever offered to any measure. At length

a point was reached at which the Government of Earl Russell found that the resignation of their offices appeared to be the most becoming method by which they could secure the early triumph of Reform.

"We resigned accordingly. The result was that the opponents of reduction in the franchise took office, and found themselves compelled by the public sentiment, after much vacillation, to make proposals on that subject which, though not only narrow, but strongly reactionary in the shape in which they were presented to Parliament, issued in the passing of a measure larger and more democratic than the Bill which, in 1866, we were told, by the highest authority, would reduce our institutions to the pattern of the American Republic.

"From the extensive, though unequal, enfranchisement which has thus been secured for the people, past experience and all present signs lead me to anticipate increased strength for our institutions, and a more vigorous march both of legislative and administrative policy. . . .

"The rapid growth of wealth, especially among the classes of the greatest activity and enterprise, has led, for a number of years past, to a diminished watchfulness, outside the walls of Parliament, respecting the great and cardinal subject of economy in the public charges, and the relation between the income of the State

and its expenditure. I earnestly desire that the paramount interest of the lately enfranchised classes in thrifty administration may operate powerfully to bring about a change. This tendency cannot but be strengthened by the present decline of the permanent revenue, and by the addition, since the present Government took office, of three millions (in round numbers) to the public charges, apart from the demands of the Abyssinian War. This increase has extended not less in the civil than in the military and naval departments. In my opinion it has not been justified either by the wishes of the country or by the demands of the public service.

"I perceive, with satisfaction, that attention has of late been increasingly directed to the local charges of the country. Their amount, the manner of their incidence, and the means provided for their administration and control appear to demand careful consideration. It will, in my opinion, be just and politic to allow to ratepayers, by the principle of representation, a control over county expenditure."

As to Primary Education, Mr. Gladstone referred to the two principles laid down by Lord John Russell in 1839 on behalf of Lord Melbourne's Government—that it was the desire of Her Majesty that the rights of conscience "should be respected, and that the youth of the country should be religiously brought up." Further legislation would

be necessary to establish the first of these principles, and in order to enforce it the State must resign the responsibility of teaching in its primary schools the creed of a sect at the expense of the nation. The address then proceeded.

“At this time one question, or group of questions, overshadows all the rest. The state of Ireland, and the actual temper of no small portion of its people towards the Throne and Government of the United Kingdom, imperatively demand the care of all public men, and of all good citizens, who would seek, not merely to live by expedients from day to day, but, looking onwards into the future, to make provision, as far as human means avail, for the strength, concord, and stability of the Empire.

“The object of a truly Liberal policy is, by equitable but decided measures to make the name of law in Ireland respected as it is in Great Britain ; to make it respected by making it loved ; and to create this attachment by creating in the national mind the conviction that law is a friend and not an enemy ; the friend of every class, but especially of those classes which have the greatest need of its protection.

“The present House of Commons has four times been called upon to suspend the Act for securing personal liberty in Ireland ; but it has not forgotten the work of improvement in that country.

"In 1866, the Government of Earl Russell addressed itself to one absolutely vital portion of this work, by introducing a Land Bill, for securing to tenants the value of their improvements, which the obstruction of the Ministers now in power prevented from passing into law.

"But this year, those Ministers, rightly judging that the necessity of coercion did not impair the obligations of justice, very deliberately proposed a policy for Ireland; did not shrink from the questions of Education and Religion; asked to establish, at the charge of the Exchequer, a Roman Catholic University; and declared their readiness to recognise the principle of religious equality in Ireland by a great change in the status of the unendowed clergy of that country, provided always that the Established Church should be maintained in its integrity. In this statement, for the sake of accuracy, I have adhered as nearly as may be to the language which they used.

"We thought that Ministers had mistaken alike the interests and the convictions of the country. We refused to open a new source of discord through the establishment by the State of any denominational University. We repudiated the policy of universal endowment. But, agreeing with the Government that the subject was ripe, we proposed a counterplan of disestablishment of

the existing Church, with strict regard to the rights of property and to vested interests, but without establishing any other Church, and with a general cessation of State endowments for religion in Ireland."

"The Established Church was the Church of a minority of the nation. But its members were not the poor; they were the rich, the well-educated, the powerful. Its funds were misappropriated. Its existence was a standing memorial of the oppression of the past. Its constitution embittered theological controversies, and brought the polemical spirit into politics.

"In the removal of this Establishment," the address continued, "I see the discharge of a debt of civil justice, the disappearance of a national, almost a world-wide reproach, a condition indispensable to the success of every effort to secure the peace and contentment of that country; finally, relief to a devoted clergy from a false position, cramped and beset by hopeless prejudice, and the opening of a freer career to their sacred ministry. . . .

"In the manner of proceeding, we ought, I think, to be governed by three considerations: a regard for Irish interests and feelings; an enlarged equity towards those who would lose in point of civil privilege; and a careful heed to the spirit of equal dealing throughout the detailed arrangements.

“After all that these rules can warrant has been done, there may remain a considerable property at the disposal of the State. The mode of its application can only, in my judgment, be suggested to Parliament by those who as a Government may have means and authority to examine fully the provisions now made by law for the various public and social wants of Ireland, and to compare in each case both the urgency of the demand and the facility of meeting it with general satisfaction. It would, however, ill consist with the principle of the measure for which we are now contending, if the State, having disestablished the Church, were to apply its funds to the teaching of religion in any other form.

“To sum up this great subject—

“Rest as we are, by common consent, we cannot. Endowment of all, after the events of the last Session, is out of the question. Retrenchment or mutilation of the existing Church, by reduction of its spiritual offices, has been proposed by a Royal Commission; but I do not learn from the latest and most authentic declarations of the Ministry that they adopt that, or indeed any other, method of proceeding. We of the Opposition, gentlemen, have done our part. The matter now rests with you. One path, at least, lies before you, broad, open, and well defined. One policy has advocates who do not shrink from its avowal. It is the policy of

bringing absolutely to an end the civil establishment of the Church of Ireland. It has received the solemn sanction of the representatives whom the nation chose in 1865. For this line of action, the only one just, and the only one available, I confidently ask your approval."

In the election speeches of the campaign it is noticeable that amongst the Liberals, not excluding Mr. Gladstone himself, Irish affairs were very much kept in the background. The Reform Act received foremost attention. Even the Liberal leader usually left the question of Ireland to be dealt with at the end of a speech, when an audience had by his oratory been brought to a fine point of enthusiasm. The Irish question was not one which either English leaders or their followers cared for in those days, and it was probably owing to its influence that Mr. Gladstone, though achieving great victories throughout the country, failed to secure his seat for South Lancashire. He was beaten by the Conservative candidates, Mr. (afterwards Viscount) Cross and Mr. Turner. The result was undoubtedly a severe personal disappointment to Mr. Gladstone, who had been quite confident as to the result. On the day of his nomination, dealing with an assertion that he was seeking another seat, Mr. Gladstone had said :

"I have not spoken a word, I have not drawn a scratch of the pen, to obtain any other seat in

Parliament than yours. And now the question for you gentlemen is, when the voice of the nation sounds in your ears, and speaks in accents which not even Mr. Turner or Mr. Cross can misunderstand . . . I ask you not to separate yourselves from the body of the nation. You are part of England. You are great ; but England is greater. With England Scotland joins, and with Scotland Ireland."

The Liberal organisers, however, had anticipated defeat for Mr. Gladstone at the hands of the South Lancashire electors, and, being beaten there, he obtained a safe and easy seat at Greenwich ; and he found himself, as the result of the elections, with an overwhelming Parliamentary majority. Mr. Disraeli resigned forthwith, taking the then unprecedented step of resigning without waiting for the new Parliament to assemble. The new Ministers received their seals of office on December 9, Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet including Mr. Lowe, Mr. Childers, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Bright. Sir William Harcourt, who had entered Parliament for the first time, was invited to join the Ministry as Queen's Advocate, but declined the invitation.

Early in the life of the new Parliament came the memorable contest between the Lords and Commons in connection with Mr. Gladstone's Bill for the Disestablishment of the Church in Ireland. A compromise was arranged, and the Bill became

law. Lord Rosebery, in this matter, had one of his first experiences (as an onlooker only) of disputes between the two Houses, to the conditions of one of which he so emphatically objects. Lord Malmesbury makes a note in his diary of July 22, 1869, which shows that Lord Rosebery was in this, as afterwards in many other matters, learning from his great leader and friend Mr. Gladstone. The note in the diary mentioned runs :

“The House of Lords has agreed to a compromise. Lord Cairns settled it with Lord Granville. . . . Gladstone wanted to throw up the Bill after the debate of last Tuesday, when the words of the preamble were re-inserted, but he was out-voted in his Cabinet; and it is said that Lord Granville told him that if he gave up the Bill he must find somebody else to lead the Lords. He must have intended to provoke a collision between the two Houses, and the feeling he showed on this occasion proves, and not for the first time, what his sentiments are against that institution.”

Mr. John Bright at this time was also expressing strong views about the position of the Peers, and hinted that “if they should attempt to obstruct or delay the Irish Church Bill they might meet with accidents not pleasant for them to think of,”—a statement which Mr. Gladstone explained away in the House of Commons as follows :

"I must say that the Government have not thought it their duty, and will not think it their duty, to consider in detail the particulars of those opinions. . . . There may be many things with which in the abstract, as propositions, the Government would agree, and yet which as a Government they might not think themselves justified or warranted in stating with regard to the action of a branch of the Legislature."

Irish affairs received a good deal of attention in the next few years. In 1870 the Irish Land Bill was introduced and passed. Its main object was to secure fixity of tenure. During the same session the Elementary Education Bill was passed, and board schools popularly managed were created to supplement the voluntary schools. The passage of the measure was not easy. A great "Non-conformist Rebellion" arose, and several important clauses of the Bill were in the nature of a compromise, especially concerning denominational education. It was the Conservative votes that enabled the Government to carry their Bill against a strong Nonconformist opposition led by Mr. Edward Miall. The combativeness of this opposition led to a somewhat bitter passage of words between that eminent Dissenter and Mr. Gladstone. It is interesting as showing how Mr. Gladstone, a Prime Minister who was master because of his great Parliamentary majority, could, when a matter became acute, assert his authority in a way which

Lord Rosebery probably often reflected upon when it was his lot, years afterwards, to be a leader almost without power. Mr. Miall, on one occasion during the fight on the Education Bill, complained, "you have led us through the Valley of Humiliation; but once bit, twice shy. And we can't stand this sort of thing much longer." Mr. Gladstone, too, was not in the mood "to stand this sort of thing much longer," and he was quite determined to get the Bill through. He thus answered Mr. Miall:

"I hope my hon. friend will not continue his support to the Government one moment longer than he deems it consistent with his sense of duty and right. For God's sake, sir, let him withdraw it the moment he thinks it better for the cause he has at heart that he should do so. So long as my hon. friend thinks fit to give us his support we will co-operate with my hon. friend for every purpose we have in common; but when we think his opinions and demands exacting, when we think he looks too much to the section of the community he adorns and too little to the interests of the people at large, we must then recollect that we are the Government of the Queen, and that those who have assumed the high responsibility of administering the affairs of this Empire must endeavour to forget the parts in the whole, and must, in the great measures they introduce into the House, propose to them-

selves no meaner or narrower object—no other object than the welfare of the Empire at large.”

Towards the end of the summer of 1870 there came the outbreak of the Franco-German war, which was to change the balance of power in Europe in so remarkable a way, and which was to be for a long while to come the main topic of public interest the world over. Everything had looked peaceful during most of the summer. July appeared to open, so far as European politics were concerned, peacefully and hopefully. The great war burst with hurricane force and rapidity almost immediately afterwards. As an anonymous writer in *The Edinburgh Review* (who we know now was Mr. Gladstone) wrote shortly afterwards :

“ Every joint of the compacted fabric of Continental Europe had been unset, and there was not one considerable State whose positions and prospects had not been fundamentally modified between the 5th of August and the 5th of September. The unclouded skies of a glorious July seemed, at the commencement of that month, only to reflect an equally cloudless tranquillity on the face of Europe. . . . But, before one week of the month had passed, the storm burst upon the world. First came diplomatic mutterings, for which a few days only were allowed. Then followed the ring of weapons making ready for the encounter, and the tramp of armed men. On the 2nd of August, in the insignificant affair of Saarbrück, the

Emperor of the French assumed a feeble offensive. On the 4th the Prussians replied energetically at Wissembourg. And then, what a torrent, what a deluge of events! In twenty-eight days ten battles were fought. Three hundred thousand men were sent to the hospitals, to captivity, or to the grave. The German enemy had penetrated into the interior of France over a distance of one hundred and fifty miles of territory, and had stretched forth everywhere as he went the strong hand of possession. The Emperor was a prisoner, and had been deposed with general consent; his family wanderers, none knew where; the embryo, at least, of a republic, born of the hour, had risen on the ruins of the Empire, while proud and gorgeous Paris was awaiting, with divided mind, the approach of the conquering monarch and his countless host."

By the time Parliament met in 1871, so rapidly did events on the Continent move, the newspapers which reported the speech by the Earl of Rosebery in moving the Address had their columns full of special correspondents' letters from besieged Paris. Political conditions at home seem to show that by this time Mr. Gladstone's power had been considerably weakened in the country. The dissatisfaction of the Nonconformists regarding the Education Bill was one, and may have been the chief, cause. Yet the year saw a great reform carried out in the Civil Service, for in

midsummer, by an Order in Council dated a year previously, all entrance appointments in the Civil Service—the Foreign Office, Diplomatic Service, and posts requiring professional knowledge excepted—had been thrown open to competition. Any lad of capacity had thus thrown open to him the opportunity of a Civil Service appointment, and the “fool of the family”—the family of influence—no longer found £300 or £400 a year waiting for him for condescending to hang up his hat in a Government office and occasionally cut a new quill. All departments of the State during the same period had their administrative machinery burnished, and a better system of promotion than had previously existed was brought into operation. The Ecclesiastical Titles Act was repealed the same year. University tests were abolished, and the Ballot Act to secure the secrecy of voting had been passed by the Commons and rejected by the Lords, who, however, passed it in the following year. The throwing open of Civil Service appointments to competition was followed by the abolition of Army purchase, Mr. Gladstone taking the sensational course of securing that reform by cancelling the Royal Warrant, under which purchase was legal, an executive act which undoubtedly was approved by the bulk of the nation. By this action Mr. Gladstone entirely superseded the House of Lords, who, without rejecting a Bill, had passed a resolution with the object of burying

the matter. It was a startling and completely successful use of the prerogative of the Crown to obtain a reform in spite of the House of Lords' objection to it.

The passage of the Licensing Act of 1872, compelling the closing of public-houses at midnight in London and earlier in the country, was another step which alienated support from the Liberal party. Mr. Gladstone's Irish University Bill of the following year was one which even his influence was insufficient to commend either to Parliament or to public opinion; even *The Daily News* described it as "a feeble compromise." The Government were beaten by a majority of three in the division, and two days afterwards the Cabinet met and decided to resign. Mr. Forster in his diary records, on March 13, a pathetic incident in connection with that meeting:

"Cabinet again at twelve. Decided to resign. . . . Gladstone made us quite a touching little speech. He began playfully. This was the last of some one hundred and fifty Cabinets or so, and he wished to say to his colleagues with what 'profound gratitude——' And here he completely broke down and could say nothing, except that he could not enter on the details. . . . Tears came to my eyes, and we were all touched."

Mr. Disraeli, always astute, declined the Queen's invitation to form a Government, and Mr. Gladstone was obliged to resume office.

Later in the year some administrative irregularities at the General Post Office were disclosed. Amongst other things this led to a rearrangement of the Cabinet, and Mr. Gladstone, in addition to the Premiership, took over the duties of Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lowe going to the Home Office. In 1874 Parliament was dissolved, on the ground, as Mr. Gladstone put it, "that the authority of the Ministry had sunk below the point necessary for the due defence and prosecution of public interests." He went to the country on a proposal to abolish the income-tax. To again quote Mr. Hirst:

"Mr. Gladstone had undoubtedly made a miscalculation in going to the country with a promise to repeal the income-tax; and he was surprised and mortified at the result. The real reason seemed to have escaped him. To the working classes it mattered very little whether the income-tax was abolished or not. The general public had grown tired of domestic reforms, and Disraeli accurately gauged the prevailing sentiment. There was indeed a serious dearth of jingo material; but he had contrived to divert the eyes of the country from the schedules of the income-tax to the 'map of the world, and more particularly to the Straits of Malacca, where, he said, the Gladstonian Government had committed acts of astounding folly and ignorance—they had even compromised freedom of trade with China and Japan.

The farmers of Aylesbury gathered to dine,
And they ate their prime beef and they drank their old wine,
With the wine there was beer, with the beer there was bacca.

The liquors went round,

And the banquet was crowned

With some thundering news from the Straits of Malacca.¹

“Public opinion was beginning to undergo a vast change. In the previous decade there had been little or no national interest in foreign countries. Merchants and manufacturers, who had special knowledge of foreign markets, kept that knowledge carefully to themselves. Ordinary people did not try to conceal their ignorance. There were few political upholsterers. Even editors seldom saw, or thought they saw, across the Channel. The strength of England was respected abroad. At home there was quiet confidence, but no enthusiasm for ‘stricken fields.’ Gradually, however, the miseries of the Crimean War faded from the national memory. A new generation was growing up with a craving for excitement.

“The difference between the two leaders was not confined to foreign politics, or to politics. It amounted to a complete antithesis. It comes out in their rhetoric, if we submit them for a moment to the acrid judgment of the satirist, Thorold Rogers, in 1872 :

¹ This squib was let off by Mr. Gladstone in one of his electioneering speeches.

Let Disraeli ventilate his shams,
And gull his dupes with hollow epigrams,
Gibe at all candour, act his studied part,
And mock his friends and foes with equal art.
Let Gladstone sentence upon sentence string,
Pile words on words, on periods periods fling,
And, highest skill which human power can reach,
Convey no meaning in a three hours' speech."

Mr. Gladstone, following the precedent set by Mr. Disraeli, resigned office before the new Parliament assembled. At the same time Mr. Gladstone had sent a letter to Lord Granville, in which, foreshadowing his coming first retirement from political life, he wrote :

"I should be desirous, shortly before the commencement of the session of 1875, to consider whether there would be advantage in my placing my services for a time at the disposal of the Liberal party, or whether I should then claim exemption from the duties I have hitherto discharged."

That resignation soon took effect, as in the following year he wrote to Lord Granville again, making the formal announcement :

"The time has, I think, arrived when I ought to revert to the subject of the letter which I addressed to you on March 12. Before determining whether I should offer to assume a charge which might extend over a length of time, I have reviewed, with all the care in my power, a number of considerations, both public and private,


of which a portion, and these not by any means insignificant, were not in existence at the date of that letter. The result has been that I see no public advantage in my continuing to act as the leader of the Liberal party; and that, at the age of sixty-five, and after forty-two years of a laborious public life, I think myself entitled to retire on the present opportunity. This retirement is dictated to me by my personal views as to the best method of spending the closing years of my life. I need hardly say that my conduct in Parliament will continue to be governed by the principles on which I have heretofore acted; and, whatever arrangements may be made for the treatment of general business, and for the advantage or convenience of the Liberal party, they will have my cordial support. I should, perhaps, add that I am at present, and mean for a short time to be, engaged on a special matter, which occupies me closely."

The "special matter" alluded to was theological controversy, afterwards the subject of a pamphlet. As every one knows, Lord Hartington was elected to succeed Mr. Gladstone in the Liberal leadership.

The election of 1874, which sent Mr. Gladstone into retirement and brought Mr. Disraeli to power, was unexpectedly sprung upon the country, and the circumstances caused a great deal of inconvenience and criticism. Mr. P. W.



CARTOON OF LORD ROSEBERY FROM "VANITY FAIR," JUNE 3, 1876.



Clayden,¹ who of course looked at matters from the Liberal journalistic standpoint, thus summed up the situation :

“ The issue placed before the country by Mr. Gladstone was never definitely taken up. The abolition of the income-tax failed as a cry probably because the prosperity of the country was so great that the mass of the people were indifferent to questions of taxation. Mr. Gladstone’s colleagues took up his financial scheme, but it was evident that they did not hope to win by its means. Mr. Forster in his address referred to that of Mr. Gladstone to explain the reasons for the dissolution, and based his claim for re-election solely on the course of his own political life. Mr. Cardwell named as the first thing the new Parliament would have to do, the decision by whom the distribution of the surplus should be made ; and Lord Hartington expressed doubts about the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourers, and said that the new Parliament would have to deal with the great questions of taxation. Mr. Lowe was more combative. He boasted that the Government had ‘ been able to carry the country through a European war without offending either party, without compromising the dignity of England, and without any injury to her allies. Had Government,’ he continued,

¹ “ England Under Lord Beaconsfield.” By P. W. Clayden. T. Fisher Unwin.

'been in other and "more energetic" hands, we might have found ourselves carrying on active hostilities against France, in order to prevent the possibility of a French invasion of the Saxon provinces of Prussia.' Sir Stafford Northcote in his address followed Mr. Disraeli's example. He told the public that it was 'vain to discuss schemes of which the attractive portion only is presented to our view.' He denied 'that there was any reaction from that general spirit of progress which had animated the people of this country under different Administrations for the last half-century, though there are many symptoms of a reaction from the excessive confidence which has been accorded to a particular school arrogating to itself the title of Liberal, and of uneasiness at the language held and the programme announced by some of its more advanced disciples.' He wished all great matters of legislation 'to be dealt with in a liberal but conservative spirit.' This was perhaps the truest approach made in any of the election addresses to the actual condition of the public mind. Mr. Goschen, however, in a speech he delivered during the election in the City of London, summed up the feeling of the middle classes in a single happy phrase. 'It is said that the country is weary of the Government. If it is weary, it is the weariness of fastidious prosperity, and not the passionate anger of a poorer or less happy people.'

“The state of unreadiness which these election addresses revealed in the leaders on both sides soon became evident in the constituencies. Everybody was angry with Mr. Gladstone for springing the dissolution so suddenly on the country. Mr. Disraeli told the electors of Buckinghamshire that it was ‘essentially un-English.’ Many members of Parliament were abroad, and had to hurry home to look after their seats; election managers were not ready with their canvassing-lists; the Liberal Committees had not looked out for candidates; everybody was taken by surprise, and everywhere ‘there was mounting in hot haste,’ as at Brussels on the eve of Waterloo. In this confusion there was no chance of adjusting differences, healing divisions, or creating organisation. The opponents of the Government were united enough on the one point of opposition to it; but nothing whatever was done to rally its friends. Indeed, some of the alienated sections of the Liberal party thought that the financial scheme had been put in the front for the purpose of driving into the background the issue in which they were interested. The London Nonconformist Committee, which had played a considerable part in the discussion on the Education Act, expressed regret and surprise that the Prime Minister had almost entirely ignored questions affecting religious equality, and advised Nonconformists resolutely to assert their views, ‘to the disregard of mere party ties.’ The

Nottingham Nonconformists resolved not to vote for any candidate who did not pledge himself to Universal School Boards, one Board School in each school district, and the unconditional repeal of the twenty-fifth clause. In many of the towns and in the rural districts the Dissenters held similar language. Their coolness to the Government had been a main feature of the political situation for three or four years. At a great Conference at Manchester in 1872 energetic speeches had been made and strong resolutions passed expressive of want of confidence in its educational policy. An active Nonconformist committee, with its headquarters at Birmingham, had carried on a vigorous agitation against this part of the Ministerial policy, and the breach between the Government and this large, active, and most important section of its supporters was never healed.

“This agitation damaged the Government in two ways. Among the active members of the Liberal party in every constituency there are good Churchmen as well as active Dissenters ; supporters of voluntary schools as well as advocates of school boards ; clergymen who think they ought to teach their religious views to the children in the national schools, as well as men who regard religion as a purely private concern with which no public institution should be mixed up.

“The elections began with a striking success. The first day of the borough elections was

Friday, January 30 ; and on that day Mr. Bright, Mr. Muntz, and Mr. Dixon were returned for Birmingham unopposed. On the next day (the 31st) the Liberal losses began."

For the rest, the Conservative candidates swept the field, and Mr. Disraeli found himself at the head of a splendid majority, and made the notable boast that he had discovered the Conservative working man, congratulating Stafford and Morpeth on having returned actual working men to represent them in Parliament.

Mr. Disraeli's Cabinet was made up as follows :

First Lord of the Treasury	. Mr. Disraeli.
Lord Chancellor.	. . . Lord Cairns.
Lord President of the Council	. The Duke of Richmond.
Lord Privy Seal	. . . Lord Malmesbury.
Foreign Secretary	. . . Lord Derby.
Secretary for India	. . . Lord Salisbury.
Colonial Secretary	. . . Lord Carnarvon.
Secretary for War	. . . Mr. Gathorne Hardy.
Home Secretary	. . . Mr. R. A. Cross.
First Lord of the Admiralty	. Mr. G. Ward Hunt.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	. Sir Stafford Northcote.
Postmaster-General	. . . Lord John Manners.

It was in this Parliament that the Eastern Question—the bugbear of English politicians ever since, and one in regard to which Lord Rosebery was destined to be particularly concerned at important epochs in his career—came into being.

According to Mr. Gladstone, it was in 1875, in the summer, that the question arose. Disturbances commenced in Bosnia and Herzegovina. By a note—the Andrassy note—the Powers, in the winter of 1875-6, proposed concerted action, with the object of compelling the Sultan to carry out reforms which he had promised to bring about. Nothing came of that. The Berlin memorandum of 1876 was the next step; but this found no favour with Mr. Disraeli, and was rejected by the English Government. In the same year the Bulgarian agitation arose, due to letters published in *The Daily News* describing atrocious cruelties which had been committed, reports which were for long denied, but the accuracy of which was proved up to the hilt and universally admitted.

In 1877 came the war between Russia and Turkey; and thenceforward the Eastern Question, above all others, occupied public attention.

Lord Rosebery had, in the years to which the preceding narration relates, been steadily coming to the front as a Liberal lord whose position and influence could not be ignored. He frequently gave evidence of the keen interest which he took in foreign questions, and in the country he was beginning to be recognised as a man of ability who had to be reckoned largely in the political future of the country. On April 19, 1877, Lord Stratheden and Campbell had drawn attention to recent circumstances of the Eastern Question,

particularly in connection with the Treaty of 1856. His speech elicited from Lord Rosebery the remark that he doubted whether, if a general election were at hand, any one would get returned who expressed himself willing to fight for the Turkish Government. Earlier, on February 22 of that year, Lord Rosebery had challenged the Prime Minister with reference to what appeared to be an inaccurate statement on the part of the latter as to the actual date of the commencement of the Bulgarian atrocities. Lord Beaconsfield replied in an amicable vein, obviously recognising that the young Earl was a man whose words were, even at that time, considered by the country to have considerable weight.

In May of 1877 Lord Rosebery was again pressing regarding Eastern questions, but on the 15th of that month he went so far as to ask whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, the time had not arrived for entering into an amicable arrangement with France and Austria by which this country might be released from the engagements of the Tripartite Treaty of April 15, 1856. He on that occasion also said that he did not believe that any Government in this country could induce us to engage in war in support of the Ottoman Empire. Lord Derby, as Foreign Secretary, replied on behalf of the Government. He said he had no complaint to make either of the question or of the manner in which it had

312 **Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches**

been put. The question of fresh arrangements might be considered at the end of the war, but to act as Lord Rosebery then suggested would, he thought, be injudicious and impolitic.

When the year 1878 opened, the Russian troops were at the gates of Constantinople. Plevna had fallen in the previous December. On January 8 the Porte opened negotiations with Russia; on the 10th the Shipka Pass was forced and a Turkish army made prisoner; on the 23rd the British fleet was ordered to the Dardanelles "to accelerate peace" and to look after British interests. On the 28th the fleet entered the Dardanelles; and on the same day, receiving fresh instructions, retired to Besika Bay. These proceedings led to the withdrawal of Lord Carnarvon from the Cabinet. Lord Derby resigned two months later in consequence of a decision to call out the Reserves. Parliament was assembled early in order that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Northcote, might propose a vote of credit of £6,000,000 towards increasing the armaments of the country. Mr. Gladstone opposed this expenditure, declaring at Oxford that it appeared to him to be the most indefensible proposition that had ever, in his time, been submitted to Parliament. Lord Beaconsfield, replying to this and other speeches, at Knightsbridge, described his rival as "a sophistical rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his

own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign his opponents and to glorify himself."

The treaty of San Stefano was signed on March 3. Prolonged negotiations, regarding which the country was not taken into the confidence of the Government, followed, and the policy of the Ministers was described by Lord Rosebery as "obscurity enlivened by sarcasm." Subsequently the fact transpired that the Cyprus Convention had secretly been made, binding Turkey to govern well, and England to protect, enforce, and sanction that good government.

On July 26, 1878, Lord Rosebery, in the House of Lords, called the attention of the House to a memorandum purporting to have been signed by the Marquis of Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff on May 30. He took exception to the obscurity which characterised the policy of the Government on the Eastern Question. He passed on to refer to the circumstances under which the agreement was divulged in the Press a few days after it was signed. "If," he proceeded, "this country was to be left in total ignorance of such matters, Parliament had better abdicate its functions and act as a registration office for registering the decrees of the Foreign Office." He did not contend that secret treaties were unknown, but he believed that this was the first time that English

statesmen had gone to a congress with a view to discussing great treaties and standing forth on behalf of public law, and had bound themselves in private at the same time to concede the stipulations which they had denounced and continued to denounce. He regretted that the Government had not seen fit to trust Parliament and the country. He expressed the deepest sympathy with Greece.

The speech drew forth a lengthy reply from Lord Salisbury (Foreign Secretary), who contrived to combine a rebuke and a compliment in a very happy manner. It may be worth while to quote the passage in question :

"The noble Earl complains that it is not in accordance with the traditions of English diplomacy to have confidential communications with foreign Powers. That statement shows the total unacquaintance he has with the inside of a Government office, and which, in the noble Earl's case, will, I have no doubt, not last long."

Lord Salisbury evidently appreciated at that time what the country fully recognised, that Lord Rosebery was certain ere long to hold Ministerial rank whenever the Liberals should return to power.

Early in August, 1878, Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury came back from the Berlin Congress bearing in their hands the treaty which was described as meaning "Peace with Honour."

Their policy and achievement were dealt with by Lord Rosebery on October 18 of that year, at a Liberal demonstration at Aberdeen. In the course of a long address he delivered himself as follows :

“ But I have said that the policy that we have to deal with is the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government. Now, the first question I want to ask is this : Has there ever been a foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government ? We are told, and they tell it pathetically occasionally, that the Government had a foreign policy, but that it was stamped out by Mr. Gladstone just when it was beginning to work ; and this Government, with an enormous majority in both Houses, with an enthusiastic country devoted to it, as we are told, tells us that its foreign policy was ruined by one man, and that man the member of an insignificant minority in the Commons' House of Parliament. Sir, we in this hall all know and love Mr. Gladstone. You in Aberdeenshire, his native county, have special cause to have affection for him ; but is it not estimating his power rather too highly to say that he was able to suppress altogether the policy of this powerful Government when he is only a member of a party which is in a small minority, and when he is not even the nominal head of that party ? Well, I am not one of those who will declare that the Government have been

deliberately reckless and wanton in pursuing this policy; but I believe that their policy, or want of policy, has landed us very much where recklessness and wantonness would have landed us. Sir, it seems to me that the policy of Her Majesty's Government is a drifting policy, because we in Parliament have heard repeatedly that the groundwork of their policy was the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire.

"Where is the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire? We often heard that the basis of their operations was the Treaty of 1856. Where is the Treaty of 1856? If a new Hogarth were to arise and paint a new series of 'The Rake's Progress,' he might make Her Majesty's Government figure as the hero succeeding to a vast inheritance, which they frittered away, bragging with loud-sounding phrases of the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire, then proceeding to forbid Russia from concluding a treaty with the Porte, and then doing the same thing, and finally drifting perfectly eagerly into a share of the spoils of the Ottoman Empire. Now I should like to discuss for a few moments what this 'Peace with Honour' really is. I believe there have been few chances of a great European settlement comparable to that afforded by the Congress at Berlin. I believe that the Congress at Vienna and the Congress at Paris afforded no such opportunities. We had the two belligerents

each exhausted by a long and harassing war ; we had France anxious to refrain from anything that might disturb the existing state of things ; we had Germany a good deal troubled with her relations to the Pope and still more troubled with her relations to Socialism. I think there never was a more favourable opportunity for a Government ambitious of an Imperial foreign policy for really carrying out a very noble foreign policy.

“Well, the result of it has been that the Congress of Berlin appears to have afforded no settlement at all. What have the Government done? They have partitioned Turkey, they have secured a doubtful fragment of the spoil for themselves, they have abandoned Greece, they have incurred responsibilities of a vast and unknown kind which no British Government had a right to incur without consulting the British Parliament or the British people. Sir, as to the partitioning of the Turkish Empire, that is a result which some of us may not be particularly inclined to regret. But it is strange to find a Government that made the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire their watchword coming back triumphantly from the Congress where that empire was partitioned among five or six Powers. It has been said by the adherents of the Government that there was no partition of the Turkish Empire. It was said that you might just as well say that Great Britain

underwent partition when she lost her American provinces. Sir, I have yet to learn that there was ever a moment when the great Powers of Europe met round a table and parcelled out the provinces of Great Britain. That is what has happened to the Turkish Empire. At Berlin, as I said before, the Powers meted out the territory of Turkey, or what portions of it were desired, to four or five Powers that asked for portions of it. But another Power was engaged behind the back of the plenipotentiaries in securing a portion for itself. That Power, gentlemen, I blush to say, was Great Britain. We rendered ourselves by that act *participes criminis*—sharers of the spoil and of the plunder of our ancient ally. We took away from ourselves the right to criticise certain Powers who were not very particular as to how they obtained territory for themselves. . . .

“I venture to say that no defeat in battle could have been so prejudicial to our prestige on the Continent as the acquisition of the island of Cyprus in the way we got it. We have taken up the position, which we never held before, of a Power that is not particular as regards the method or the means by which it acquires territory for itself. I honestly think that, believing in our elevated integrity of purpose and in the disinterestedness of the policy we were accustomed to pursue, we were regarded as the police of Europe. I ask you to judge how, after the

transactions of the last few months, we can keep up our moral reputation on the Continent. We have flaunted the treaty of 1856 in the face of other Powers as our banner and our motto, and when it came to affect ourselves we treated it as so much waste paper. Well, we have gained an unhealthy island, of which we have had enough; but we have lost in exchange that of which we cannot have too much, the sympathy and respect of surrounding nations. . . .

“Well, though the acquisition of Cyprus is a very doubtful acquisition both in its method and results, it is a flea-bite compared to that larger transaction of which it is part—I mean the Convention by which, in exchange for reforms promised by the Porte, we undertake the defence of the Porte’s Asiatic dominions. Sir, you will remember that this news fell on the nation like a thunderbolt. It was announced to us without further explanation, and no further explanation has been given. But what we gather from it is this, that, in exchange for certain reforms to be executed in Asia Minor, we promised to maintain the frontiers of Asia Minor against Russia or against any other nation. What do these reforms mean? We have heard absolutely nothing of these reforms from the moment after the Convention was signed, and all that the Government papers are able to telegraph from Constantinople is that Sir Austen Layard has had an interview

with the Sultan, or Sir Austen Layard has had dinner with the Sultan. Turkish reforms have been promised with every sanctity of pledge a score of times before. English ambassadors have called on the Sultan countless times, but no reforms have ever taken place. We arrive at this dilemma: either the Turkish reforms are to be undertaken by the Turks, in which case we know from experience that there will be no reforms at all; or they will be undertaken by Great Britain, by British officers, in which case it will mean the practical annexation of Asia Minor to this country. Well, at this moment it appears to suit the purpose of the Government to treat Turkey as if she were able to undertake these reforms.

“You will have observed all through these negotiations that we actually treat Turkey as a great Power. Sir, there never was so deliberate a mistake as that. Turkey is not a great Power; she is an impotence. We talk of her as a great Power when we find it convenient, and we treat her as a great impotence when we find it convenient. We are told that this great impotence, as I venture to call it, is going to give a large measure of reform in Asia Minor, and, as Mr. Cross has said, we have conferred a great benefit on the Ottoman Empire. That is not the point we have a doubt about. The question is whether the taxpayers of this country wish

to confer that benefit at great risk upon the Ottoman Empire. . . .

“What I have to ask this great meeting is: Are you prepared to undertake the responsibility of defending the dominions of the Ottoman Empire, and to undertake the civil reform of that large country? Have we not responsibility enough as it is? We have Canada, which, I believe, has been coveted by others; we have Australia; we have a great part of Africa; we have the whole of India. Are these not enough for this island to undertake? Are you prepared beyond that to undertake the government of an entire dominion besides? Are you, as taxpayers, to pay your money for this object? Are you as men prepared to shed your blood for the maintenance of the Asiatic dominions of the Porte? Are you prepared, without consultation, without having your opinion even asked, to undertake these enormous responsibilities, and this enormous tax on the treasure and the blood of this country? . . . We are told it is not a matter of choice; that it is necessary for the preservation of India. Sir, I believe it is no more necessary for the preservation of India than it is necessary that we should damage Spain in order that we should keep Gibraltar. But I do say this, that we may pay too great a price even for the preservation of India.”

During the closing period of Mr. Disraeli's

government the wars in Afghanistan and Zululand occupied the attention of Parliament and the country. Towards the end of 1879, the thoughts of every one were turning to the coming general election. The Opposition had long been demanding it. It was certain that the contest at the polls must take place in 1880. It came in the spring of that year, and practically commenced with Mr. Gladstone's first Midlothian campaign in November, 1879, which saw Mr. Gladstone return to the leadership and start the electoral fight in which Lord Rosebery took a specially interesting part.

CHAPTER XII

THE FIRST MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN—PREPARING FOR MR. GLADSTONE—SPEECH AT HAWICK—"IMPERIUM ET LIBERTAS"—THE DUTY OF VOTERS—LORD ROSEBERY'S ILLNESS—THE SECOND MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN—ROSEBERY VERSUS BUCCLEUCH—"WATCHWORDS OF LIBERAL POLICY"—"PEACE AND FREEDOM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD"—THE LIBERAL VICTORY—"THE UNCROWNED KING OF SCOTLAND"

IN the middle of November, 1879, Mr. Gladstone commenced his first Midlothian campaign, proceeding northwards and stopping *en route* at numerous places where he addressed large public gatherings. Lord and Lady Rosebery had gone to Dalmeny at the end of October to prepare for Mr. Gladstone's reception; and for a considerable period before Lord Rosebery had been carefully organising the Liberals of the Scottish kingdom in the hope, which was to be realised, that there would be at the election a great victory for his party in the country which was his home. Mr. Gladstone had resolved to leave his Greenwich constituency, and he had refused several invitations to stand for other constituencies, because he had resolved to make the attack, which Lord Rosebery was especially anxious he should do, upon the

metropolitan county of Scotland, where the Buccleuch influence was believed to be overwhelming. There was no doubt that the bold attack of Mr. Gladstone, in his seventieth year, upon this stronghold, appealed with special force to the chivalric Scottish character, and had no little to do with the wild enthusiasm which was displayed. Yet this journey in the autumn of 1879 was only a preliminary success. The enthusiasm was to be still greater a few months afterwards, when the country was in the throes of the actual electoral fight.

Lord Rosebery having, during the first weeks of November, carefully prepared the way for his chief, was called upon to address a meeting of Liberals on his own account at Hawick on November 15. His speech was a vigorous and unsparing onslaught upon the Ministry.

"There is no doubt," he said, "that the part of a recent speech of the Prime Minister to which we are meant to give attention is the watchword, *Imperium et Libertas*. That is a watchword which ought not to be rashly arrogated to any political party. I will not discuss at any length whether our Empire is liberty, but I maintain that the carrying out of a very dangerous and wild policy, which has involved a large expenditure and a large loss of life, without consulting the country in any way whatever, is substantially an infringement of our liberties. If the country's taxes are spent,

and the blood of its citizens shed, without the people being consulted, I presume that they are not in a state of absolute freedom. But it is about the word 'Empire' that I always feel a gloomy foreboding. Her Majesty's Government use it as the last and sacred standard, and I confess I am still trembling with foreboding when I think of the way in which the Prime Minister used it the other day. In the mouths of Her Majesty's Ministers, 'Empire' is not a word of good omen. It used to be the boast of our greatest statesmen that the English were proud to extend to others those blessings they enjoyed themselves, and it is the most regrettable part of the policy of Her Majesty's Government that they have broken that tradition and keep liberty as a luxury for home consumption."

The occasion of the Hawick meeting was the affiliation of the East and North of Scotland Liberal Association. Under any circumstances a population so Liberal as that of Hawick might have been expected to make much of such an event; but it need hardly be said, as *The Scotsman* remarked, "that the presence of the popular nobleman who presides over the parent society gave additional *éclat* to the public recognition of a most promising daughter."

At a luncheon given at the Tower Hotel Lord Rosebery, in responding to the toast of his health, took occasion to refer to the usefulness of

Liberal clubs. They were of use "not merely in districts where contests existed, but as a means of preparing for eventualities, not only in the place itself but in the neighbourhood." The principal speech of the day was delivered at a meeting held later in the Corn Exchange. There Lord Rosebery spoke also of the usefulness of Liberal associations :

"Gentlemen, we must not disregard the importance of Liberal associations. You know well that wherever there is a contest going on there Conservative associations are springing up like mushrooms, and wherever those Conservative associations are springing up, whether they be wanted or not, there is always some gentleman or other in the midst of them—generally of the legal persuasion—to exhort them, in order that the pestilence of Liberalism may be stayed. If these associations are necessary to preserve the old wooden figure-head of Toryism, how much more necessary are they to preserve the jarring unities of the Liberal party! And that to me is the importance of these associations. We do not require them to keep alive the sacred flame of Liberalism, because although that may flicker yet it never dies. Yet I think we do require them in order that Liberals may learn by contact with Liberals to rub off some of their separate prejudices, and to know, by contact with their fellow-men, how necessary it is to sacrifice a part

in order that one may obtain the main point, and how difficult it is while securing a principle to carry that principle to its logical and general conclusion.

“Now I should like to say one word—and I think you will allow me, because I say it from pure devotion to the party, and in a spirit of good-humour—as to some of our best friends who feel a difficulty in voting for Liberal candidates if these Liberal candidates do not vote for one particular question which they have very much at heart. I have very many of those friends myself. I know their high, their holy feelings in regard to those questions, but I confess I am sometimes surprised when they feel it necessary to take the course that they do in regard to the election of members of Parliament. Some of them feel it to be their duty to abstain from voting altogether. That seems to me to be carrying rather too far the principle of total abstinence. But there are others who go further, and who say, ‘If our Liberal candidate will not vote for our particular question we shall be compelled, cordially as we detest him, to vote for the Tory.’ Now, that seems to me an almost inconceivable proposition, that because your Liberal candidate, with whom you agree on every point but one, should decline, in the honesty of his conviction, to follow your convictions on that point, you should vote for the Tory, who not only disagrees with you on that

point, but whom you consider mischievous and misguided on every other point of politics. . . . The question of abstaining seems to me a very serious one, because I think those who abstain should consider this: are they justified, possessing as they do the Parliamentary franchise, to keep that talent hidden in a napkin, and not to exercise it at all? It seems to me doubtful if it is not almost as great an evil as misusing the franchise, to have the franchise and not to use it at all."

Mr. Gladstone left Liverpool on November 24, and there were enthusiastic demonstrations at St. Helens, Wigan, Preston, and other railway stations. At Carlisle, Hawick, Galashiels, and elsewhere, addresses were presented and speeches delivered. The arrival at Edinburgh was one of the great scenes of the journey. On his arrival at the Waverley Station his host, Lord Rosebery, was awaiting him ready to drive him to Dalmeny Park; and Lord Rosebery, amid thunders of applause, when the train had come to a standstill at the platform, handed out of the saloon Mrs. Gladstone, and then shook hands with Mr. Gladstone and other gentlemen. The passage through the streets, in an open carriage with Lord Rosebery, was like that of a monarch, or a conquering hero. The avenues leading to Dalmeny were lined with torch-bearers, and bonfires were lighted in the district at night. On the following

night Mr. Gladstone delivered a speech at the Edinburgh Music Hall, and in the course of the next fortnight he spoke nearly a dozen times—often at railway stations. He was presented with addresses by the corporations of Glasgow and Edinburgh. At several of the meetings Lord Rosebery presided, but it was particularly noticeable how careful he was to keep personally in the background as much as possible.

It was during this stay of Mr. Gladstone with him that the love for his great leader was evidenced. Some who were able to see a little of the home life at Dalmeny at the time have declared that Lord and Lady Rosebery cared for Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone as tenderly and devotedly as if they had been their dearest relatives. One of the most brilliant events of this first Midlothian campaign was a reception given by Lord Rosebery, which was attended by many of the leading Liberals from many parts of Scotland. Those who attended were able to inspect the innumerable gifts with which Mr. Gladstone had been presented during his visit to Scotland. At a great meeting in the Corn Exchange Lord Rosebery, in introducing Mr. Gladstone to the audience, spoke of "that silvery voice which has enchanted Scotland and enchained the world. From his home in Wales to the metropolis of Scotland there has been no village too small to afford a crowd to greet him, no cottager so humble that he could

not find a light to put in his window as he passed. Mothers have brought their babes to lisp a welcome, old men have crept forth from their homes to see him before they died." Everywhere, too, there was evidenced not only the love of the people for Mr. Gladstone, but the deep affection which was extended to Lord Rosebery, whose popularity was such that he was spoken of in the newspapers at the time as the most popular man in Scotland. In December of this year, when Mr. Gladstone went to the Glasgow University, that institution made Lord Rosebery an LL.D.

During the winter of 1879-80 several bye-elections took place, the most notable being at Southwark, where Mr. (now Sir) Edward Clarke secured a Conservative victory, which entirely misled Lord Beaconsfield as to the feelings of the electors, and there is no doubt precipitated the general election. The Parliamentary session was opened by the Queen in person on the 5th of February. In her speech the Queen spoke hopefully of "the maintenance of European peace on the principles laid down in the Treaty of Berlin," and of the Convention with Turkey for the suppression of the Slave Trade. She also told of the disaster at Cabul, and the rapid march of the avenging army; and gave a hopeful account of the state of things in South Africa. In the domestic paragraphs of her speech the Queen

mentioned the Commission on Agricultural Depression, the distress in Ireland, and the measures of relief, some of which had already been taken, and for which an Act of Indemnity was required. There was a very small list of Bills to be proposed, none of them of first importance. It was a small programme, and nobody believed that the Session would be a long one. But no hint of a coming dissolution fell from the Ministers. They began bringing in their Bills, and laying out the work of the year with as much energy and seriousness as though the seventh session of the Parliament was going to be carried through. The country, and Parliament too, however, scarcely regarded the proceedings with patience, for all thoughts were turned on the general election, which could not be for long delayed. It was, however, thought most likely that the contest would be postponed till the autumn, and when the announcement came, on March 8, that Parliament would be dissolved as soon as possible after the Budget had been brought in, a good deal of surprise was felt. The announcement was made in the House of Commons by Sir Stafford Northcote, neither Mr. Gladstone nor Lord Hartington being in the House at the time. On the next morning the newspapers published the following letter from the Prime Minister to the Duke of Marlborough, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland:

" 10, DOWNING STREET, *March 8, 1880.*

" MY LORD DUKE,—

" The measures respecting the state of Ireland, which Her Majesty's Government so anxiously considered with your Excellency, and in which they were much aided by your advice and authority, are now about to be submitted for the Royal assent, and it is at length in the power of the Ministers to advise the Queen to recur to the sense of her people. The arts of agitators, which represented that England, instead of being the generous and sympathising friend, was indifferent to the dangers and the sufferings of Ireland, have been defeated by the measures, at once liberal and prudent, which Parliament has almost unanimously sanctioned.

" During the six years of the present Administration the improvement of Ireland, and the content of our fellow-countrymen in that island, have much occupied the care of the Ministry, and they may remember with satisfaction that in this period they have solved one of the most difficult problems connected with its government and people, by establishing a system of public education open to all classes and all creeds.

" Nevertheless a danger, in its ultimate results scarcely less disastrous than pestilence and famine, and which now engages your Excellency's anxious attention, distracts that country. A portion of its population is attempting to sever the constitutional

tie which unites it to Great Britain in that bond which has favoured the power and prosperity of both.

"It is hoped that all men of light and leading will resist this destructive doctrine. The strength of this nation depends on the unity of feeling which should pervade the United Kingdom and its widespread dependencies. The first duty of an English Minister should be to consolidate that co-operation which renders irresistible a community educated, as our own, in an equal love of liberty and law.

"And yet there are some who challenge the expediency of the Imperial character of this realm. Having attempted, and failed, to enfeeble our Colonies by their policy of decomposition, they may perhaps now recognise in the disintegration of the United Kingdom a mode which will not only accomplish but precipitate their purpose.

"The immediate dissolution of Parliament will afford an opportunity to the nation to decide upon a course which will materially influence its future fortunes and shape its destiny.

"Rarely in this century has there been an occasion more critical. The power of England and the peace of Europe will largely depend on the verdict of the country. Her Majesty's present Ministers have hitherto been enabled to secure that peace, so necessary to the welfare of all civilised countries, and so peculiarly the interest of our own. But this ineffable blessing cannot be

obtained by the passive principle of non-interference. Peace rests on the presence, not to say the ascendancy, of England in the Councils of Europe. Even at this moment the doubt, supposed to be inseparable from popular election, if it does not diminish, certainly arrests her influence, and is a main reason for not delaying an appeal to the national voice. Whatever may be its consequences to Her Majesty's present advisers, may it return to Westminster a Parliament not unworthy of the power of England, and resolved to maintain it.

"I have the honour to be, my Lord Duke,

"Your faithful servant,

"BEACONSFIELD."

Three days after the publication of this letter Mr. Gladstone and Lord Hartington issued their election addresses. Mr. Gladstone "rejoiced at the dissolution," but condemned the sudden interruption of the session "as a striking departure from established custom." The address added :—

"In the electioneering address which the Prime Minister has issued, an attempt is made to work upon your fears by dark allusions to the repeal of the Union and the abandonment of the Colonies.

"Those who endangered the Union with Ireland were the party that maintained there an alien Church, an unjust land law, and franchises inferior

to our own ; and the true supporters of the Union are those who firmly uphold the supreme authority of Parliament, but exercise that authority to bind the three nations by the indissoluble tie of liberal and equal laws.

“ As to the Colonies, Liberal administrations set free their trade with all the world, gave them popular and responsible government, undertook to defend Canada with the whole strength of the Empire, and organised the great scheme for uniting the several settlements of British North America into one Dominion ; to which, when we quitted office in 1866, it only remained for our successors to ask the ready assent of Parliament. It is by these measures that the Colonies have been bound in affection to the Empire, and the authors of them can afford to smile at baseless insinuations.

“ The true purpose of these terrifying insinuations is to hide from view the acts of the Ministry and their effect upon the character and condition of the country. To these I will now begin to draw your attention. With threescore years and ten upon my head, I feel the irksomeness of the task ; but in such a crisis no man should shrink from calls which his duty may make and his strength allow.

“ At home the Ministers have neglected legislation ; aggravated the public distress by continual shocks to confidence ; augmented the public

expenditure and taxation for purposes not merely unnecessary but mischievous ; and plunged the finances, which were handed over to them in a state of singular prosperity, into a series of deficits unexampled in modern times.

“ Abroad they have strained, if they have not endangered the prerogative by gross misuse, have weakened the Empire by needless wars, unprofitable extensions, and unwise engagements ; and have dishonoured it in the eyes of Europe by filching the Island of Cyprus from the Porte under a treaty clandestinely concluded in violation of the Treaty of Paris, which formed part of the international law of Christendom.

“ If we turn from considerations of principle to material results, they have aggrandised Russia, lured Turkey on to her dismemberment, if not to her ruin, replaced the Christian population of Macedonia under a debasing yoke, and loaded India with the costs and dangers of a prolonged and unjustifiable war ; while they have at the same time augmented her taxation and curtailed her liberties.

“ As to the domestic legislation of the future, it is in the election address of the Prime Minister a perfect blank. No prospect is opened to us of effectual alteration in the Land Laws, of better security for occupiers, of reform and extension of local government throughout the three kingdoms, of a more equal distribution of

political franchises, or of progress in questions deeply affecting our social and moral condition. It seems, then, that, as in the past so in the future, you will look with more confidence to the Liberal party for the work of domestic improvement.

“In the mouth of the present Ministry the claim is to ascendancy in the Councils of Europe. . . . There is indeed an ascendancy in European Councils to which Great Britain might reasonably aspire, by steadily sustaining the character of a Power, no less just than strong, attached to liberty and law, jealous of peace, and therefore opposed to intrigue and aggrandisement, from whatever quarter they may come ; jealous of honour, and therefore averse to the clandestine engagements which have marked our two latest years. To attain a moral and unenvied ascendancy such as this is indeed a noble object for any Minister or any Empire.”

The second Midlothian campaign commenced on March 16, and Mr. Gladstone was again, this time for nearly three weeks, the guest of Lord and Lady Rosebery at Dalmeny. In the meantime there had been a very trying period for the Earl and Countess. Following upon the first Midlothian campaign they had, just after Christmas, visited Italy for a few weeks. Almost immediately after their return, and while they were at the town house in Piccadilly which they

then leased, the Earl was attacked with scarlet fever. His condition was for a time most serious, and it was feared at one time that he would not recover. The skill of the doctors, and especially the nursing of his wife, who was with him all the time, pulled him through. The Countess permitted no one to interfere with her wifely right to take every risk for the husband to whom she was devoted. Lord Rosebery recovered, and rose from his bed of sickness to take his part in the contest which Mr. Gladstone fought, and which Lord Rosebery had organised against the Conservative influence—the influence practically of the name and family of Buccleuch. The fight at Midlothian was Gladstone against Dalkeith, as the representative of Lord Beaconsfield's policy. But it was more than that. It was essentially a contest between the Primroses and the lords of Buccleuch.

It is twenty years ago, but there are many still alive who witnessed the remarkable scenes which characterised the beginning of this second campaign of Mr. Gladstone. Four days before he left King's Cross, sent away with the cheers of thousands of admirers ringing in his ears, he had addressed a meeting in Marylebone, and the feelings which were aroused in many breasts were well described in a word-picture of the scene given by Mr. W. L. Watson in an article in *The Outlook*.

"The occasion was not to be forgotten by any one who had fought his way into the hall. First came the rush and the crush and the resistless sweep onwards; then an hour listening to local nobodies.

"At last there was a cheer and a huge commotion. By mysterious magic a lane was formed, up which, craning my neck, I saw advancing a pale-faced, slim figure, with the head of age and a rapt intense gaze, struggling forward to the platform, followed by a simply clothed woman, who busied herself in warding off the hands of enthusiasts eager to touch him, or pat his back, or help him forward.

"That is Mrs. Gladstone, with the soft face, high-coloured as a girl's, and tremulous mouth; intent on one thing only in this life—her husband. They step up to the platform by a reporter's stool. A dozen willing hands would aid him, but it is hers which grasps his ankle to steady him, lest in his eagerness he slip. He does not sit down, but exchanges a few rapid words with the chairman. She begs a seat immediately behind him. Forth he stands and begins at once: 'Mr. Chairman.' She pulls at his overcoat, and one sleeve comes free. Impatiently he stops while she tugs at the other sleeve, and the coat has scarcely gone from him ere he is flourishing in our faces the free hand: 'Mr. Chairman and Fellow-electors of *Marrilbone*,' for so he called

our parish, doubtlessly designedly. Never shall I, an unenthusiastic non-party man, forget those tones. Surrendering myself to the prevalent sentiment, it seemed to me as if some one had touched the stop of a mysterious organ that searched us through and through. Two more sentences, and we were fairly launched upon a sea of passion, regardless of Mrs. Gladstone, who sat behind placidly folding her husband's overcoat. In that torrent of passion the petty politics of the hour figured as huge first principles, and the opinions of the people became as the edicts of eternity. As it went on we became persuaded that the Government, whose resignation was then impending, were the most incompetent set of reprobates that an angry Heaven had ever sent to curse a country. It grew upon us as a marvel why we had not seen this earlier. Why we had lived under such diabolical ineptitude astounded us with a sense of shame; and ever and again was rolled out our patent of nobility, 'Fellow-electors of Marrilbone,' until we became enlarged, quickened, glorified by our fraternity.

"Oh the graces of that speech! 'Gentlemen, this has been a liquid, aqueous Government. You remember what it came in upon?' 'Beer!' we shouted, and the orator bowed with a gesture of infinite smiling consent. 'And you see what it is going out upon?' 'Water!' we yelled, remembering Mr. Cross's Bill; and again he bowed

in acquiescence, like a conjurer who acknowledges the applause that greets the production from the breast-pocket of one of the audience of the watch previously fired from a blunderbuss. In next day's newspaper this passage read: 'Gentlemen, this has been a liquid Government; it came in on beer and will go out on water.' Gladstone never said that: it is but a miserable paraphrase of what was said—of what *we* said. All through a speech of long tortuous sentences he endowed us with a faculty of apprehension we did not know we possessed. And then the peroration: 'You are shortly to pronounce your verdict, you and the people of these isles; and whatever that verdict be, as I hope it will be the true one, I trust it will be clear.' We leaped to our feet and cheered; decidedly we should make it clear. 'I trust it will be emphatic.' We waved our sticks and hats in emphasis. 'I trust it will be decisive, and that it will ring' (here, with a swing of the arm clear round his neck, and a superb uplifting of the whole frame, he sent his trumpet voice into every cranny of the hall till it rang again) 'from John o' Groats to the Land's End,' and a frantic mass of humanity roared themselves hoarse for a full two minutes. When I stood in the free air outside once more, it seemed somewhat unreasoning, all this ecstasy; clearly I had been Gladstonised; and I voted for him at that election."

Mr. Gladstone's welcome in Scotland surpassed

that which he had received in the previous November. The labours of that election would have been magnificent in the ablest of men twenty or thirty years his junior. That he was able at his threescore and ten years to accomplish so much was undoubtedly due to no small extent to the loving care of the Earl and Countess of Rosebery. "The uncrowned King of Scotland," as Lord Rosebery has often been called, and his wife watched over Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone with that almost filial love and devotion which they always displayed to their venerable friends. The Earl—unable, because a peer, to take an active part in the election—had secured 120, George Street, Edinburgh, as a central home for Mr. Gladstone during this period. Nothing seemed to tire Mr. Gladstone at first. He performed feats of endurance and labour that no statesman has ever, probably, equalled. But his host and hostess insisted upon him taking a rest after the first week of the campaign, and, at Dalmeny, Mr. Gladstone cut down trees as he was cutting down political opponents, and planted new trees in the park surrounding his host's beautiful home which were to develop in strength as the political power and influence of the talented young lord were in the years to come to grow.

Mr. Gladstone laid the stress of this election upon foreign policy, and as Lord Rosebery was subsequently to become Foreign Secretary, some

remarks of Mr. Gladstone at this time may be recalled. Characterising as a slander the allegation that the return to power of the Liberals would mean putting an end to the engagements abroad entered into by the Beaconsfield Government, he laid down this dictum on the subject of the continuity of foreign policy :

“Gentlemen, a more baseless fiction never was conceived in the brain of man, for I suppose it was conceived in the brain—I do not know that there is any other organ that is capable of it—and never was imputed in words by his tongue or by his faculty of speech. We have no power, gentlemen, to relieve you from engagements of honour and good faith entered into by the present Government through a summary process. However we may disapprove them, however we may deplore them, however we have striven to point out—not to you, for you have not had a fair chance yet, but to that majority in the House of Commons which has been perfectly deaf to our arguments—however we may have striven to point out to them the mischiefs and the dangers of the course they were pursuing, we must take the consequences ; the country must take the consequences. Prudence, care, diligence, may do much in the course of time ; but whatever good faith requires must be accepted and fulfilled.”

He also dealt with the Manchester School and the “Peace-at-any-Price” faction ;

“It is said that if the Liberals come into power the Manchester School will rule the destinies of the country. I will endeavour to tell you a portion of the truth upon that subject. What is called the Manchester School has never ruled the foreign policy of this country—never during a Conservative Government, and never especially during a Liberal Government. Do not let me be supposed to speak of what is called the Manchester School, or sometimes the Peace party, as if I were about to cast disrespect upon them. Gentlemen, I respect them even in what I think to be their great and serious error. I think it is, I will venture to say, like many errors in our mixed condition. It is not only a respectable, it is even a noble error. Abhorring all selfishness of policy, friendly to freedom in every country of the earth, attached to the modes of reason, and detesting the ways of force, this Manchester School—this Peace party—has sprung prematurely to the conclusion that wars may be considered as having closed their melancholy and miserable history, and that the affairs of the world may henceforth be conducted by methods more adapted to the dignity of man, more suited both to his strength and to his weakness, less likely to lead him out of the ways of duty, to stimulate his evil passions, to make him guilty before God of inflicting misery on his fellow-creatures. But, gentlemen, no Government of

this country could ever accede to the management and control of affairs without finding that that dream of a Paradise upon earth was rudely dispelled by the shock of experience. However we may detest war—and you cannot detest it too much—there is no war except one, the war for liberty, that does not contain in it elements of corruption, as well as of misery, that are deplorable to recollect and to consider; but, however deplorable they may be, they are among the necessities of our condition; and there are times when justice, when faith, when the welfare of mankind, require a man not to shrink from the responsibility of undertaking them.”

Lord Rosebery, although debarred from the full pleasures of the electoral fight, found an opportunity in the course of the campaign to refer to the question of foreign policy. On the evening of March 29, 1880, while the General Election was in progress, he presided at the annual banquet of the Glasgow University Gladstone Club. In speaking to the toast of the Club, he dealt at length with the assertion that the Government of Lord Beaconsfield was more acceptable to the Continental Powers than that of Mr. Gladstone would be, pointing out that Lord Palmerston, to whom the Tories referred as their beau-ideal of a Foreign Minister, was cordially detested by Foreign Powers, and contending that the approbation of the policy of the

Government expressed in such a quarter was not a point in favour of that policy. In concluding his remarks, he said :

“ But I will in conclusion give my rendering of what I believe to be the policy of the Liberal party : I believe that our watchword in foreign policy—and I think you will confirm it—I believe that our watchword will be the cause of England, peace and freedom throughout the world. When I say peace, I do not mean peace at any price. When I say freedom, I do not mean license. When I say England, I mean not merely these two islands, I mean the great Empire throughout the world, which we are as proud of as any Tory party can possibly be—which we will maintain even with our blood if necessary, but which we will not recklessly increase at the cost of the people of England.”

Two days later, on March 31, the inaugural banquet of the Scottish Liberal Club was held at Edinburgh. The principal speech of the evening was that of Mr. Gladstone, who spoke to the toast of the Club, to which Lord Rosebery responded. He joined issue with the supporters of the Government on several points, in particular repudiating the idea that under the previous Liberal administration England did not carry weight in the councils of Europe. As to this notion he uttered the following forcible sentences :

“ The thing is absurd, and what I think is

the most painful part of the absurdity is this—that the present Government is supposed to have brought England to her proper place in the councils of Europe. Gentlemen, it was said by the great Napoleon that we were a nation of shopkeepers. Well, that reproach has vanished, because under the present Government our trade has vanished too. But, sir, it may some day be said, if the Government is carried on as it is now, that we are not a nation of shopkeepers, but a nation of pettifoggers, prepared to go into the councils of Europe with secret agreements with Foreign Powers, and with little terminable leases of foreign islands which do not belong to us, and which we have managed to filch out of the general scramble.” He maintained that the Liberal party did not sympathise with the Russian Government, but were not afraid of Russia; in this respect differing from the Conservative party.

A personal reference also occurs in this speech : “ It was only about a month ago, when I was confined to my room with illness, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was good enough to say, in his place as leader of the House of Commons, that whenever the subject of peers’ interference at elections occurred to his mind, it was always associated with the name of Rosebery.”

Lord Rosebery was greatly amused at some of the attacks which had been levelled at him because he as a Liberal, though a peer, was trying to

further the Liberal cause in Scotland. At the banquet he read out some of the results of electoral contests which had been decided ; and, cheers being given for the Countess of Rosebery, he said, amidst much merriment : " I am afraid that my wife is a little apt to go beyond the rules prescribed for the inanimate nature of peers in her sympathy with the Liberal party. Not that she canvasses, or does anything wrong (at which remark the company laughed loudly and long), but her wishes are so absolutely with the Liberal party, that we shall be the better for the rest of the week when she is acquainted with the results of this evening."

Mr. Gladstone's last speech of the election was delivered at West Calder, on April 2. Mr. Gladstone, besides being nominated at Midlothian, where he fought, had also been nominated at Leeds, where he was elected by a great majority to a seat which was afterwards accepted by his son, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, who had been beaten in Middlesex. The election in Midlothian, the key to the general election, took place on April 5. Mr. Gladstone's opponent was the Earl of Dalkeith, son of the Duke of Buccleuch. The result of the election was :

Gladstone	1,579
Dalkeith	1,368
					<hr/>
Majority	211

It was the largest poll which had ever been recorded in Midlothian, and the result was received with exultation in the country, and with wild delight by the Scottish Liberals. When the news of the result came Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone were dining with the Earl and Countess of Rosebery at the house in George Street, and in response to the demands of the huge crowd which had gathered, they went out on to the balcony, in view of the people, and lighted candles were held on either side of Mr. Gladstone so that the crowd might be gratified by the sight of his animated, joyful face. Speeches, of course, were called for, and made; and at last the Earl of Rosebery found himself free to address an election crowd. He said:

"The election is over, and I am unmuzzled. As a Midlothian man I can tell you that no Midlothian man, however old he may be, or however long he may have to live, will have spent a prouder night than this. It is a great night for Midlothian, a great night for Scotland, a great night for your county member, a great night for Great Britain, aye, and a great night for the world. It has been the fortune of this county to be chosen as the central battlefield of that great contest that is being waged at this moment. In the county of Midlothian has been fought, not a battle between Whig and Tory, or Liberal and Conservative, but a battle of constitutional government

and of oppressed nationalities throughout the world. And what has been the reward of Midlothian? She has fought this battle—you have fought this battle, by and for yourselves, and you are rewarded by having, as your county member, the foremost man of Great Britain, the greatest champion of liberty that now lives in the world; and, to use the words of Pitt, I will only say now that I trust that Midlothian, having saved herself by her own exertions, will save Great Britain by her example."

There were great doings in the city that night. Mr. Gladstone, the victory won, left Edinburgh for Dalmeny with Lord Rosebery in the evening. Election results were known earlier in those days. All England knew the result of the Midlothian contest by half-past seven, and Mr. Gladstone was on his way for rest at Dalmeny by nine o'clock.

The great contest had been fought and won. Midlothian, no doubt, had a great effect on all the contests which then remained to be decided. "The father and son of the Scottish people," as Mr. Gladstone and Lord Rosebery were now frequently styled, had won Midlothian. That same night, when total results were counted, the Liberals had gained sixty-one seats, counting one hundred and twenty-two on a division, and it was certain that Mr. Gladstone would succeed Lord Beaconsfield as Prime Minister. When the

elections were all over the Liberals had taken one hundred and thirty-five seats from their opponents, and the Conservatives had turned the scale with only twenty-three against them. The balance in favour of the Liberals was one hundred and twelve.

CHAPTER XIII

AFTER THE 1880 ELECTION—MR. GLADSTONE'S SECOND PREMIERSHIP—
LORD ROSEBERY'S REFUSAL OF OFFICE—SUBSEQUENT ACCEPTANCE
—UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT—
THE IRISH QUESTION—AGRARIAN TROUBLES—COERCION MEASURES
—GLADSTONE AND PARNELL—ASSASSINATION OF LORD FREDERICK
CAVENDISH AND MR. BURKE—FOUNDATION OF THE NATIONAL
LIBERAL CLUB — DISABILITIES OF PEERS — LORD ROSEBERY'S
RESIGNATION—A NEW DEPARTMENT OF STATE—THE SECRETARY
FOR SCOTLAND ACT

THERE was no doubt that the country expected Mr. Gladstone to become Premier as the result of the elections. True, Lord Hartington was at the time the recognised leader of the Liberal party, and at the close of the elections he was, in conformity with constitutional usage, sent for by the Queen and asked to form a ministry. It was clear, however, that Mr. Gladstone's activities in the Midlothian campaign virtually meant his return to the leadership of the Liberal party, and Lord Rosebery expressed the feelings of the bulk of that party when he said that: "There would be no real gladness in the victory if any other leader was to be given them." Some little time, however, was taken in settling this important question, and the

situation at the time was well described by Mr. F. W. Hirst.¹

"It has been asserted very commonly," he wrote, "that Lord Hartington, out of 'loyalty' to Mr. Gladstone, did not attempt to form a ministry. The assertion contains one error of fact and one of feeling. Lord Hartington did not, nor was there much reason why he should, entertain any feeling of loyalty for Mr. Gladstone. He was still the Liberal leader in the House of Commons; he had only remained in that position because, at the request of the whips, who did not like to change horses while crossing the stream, he had not insisted on resigning a post which he knew to have been practically vacated in the course of the first Midlothian campaign. He is believed to have represented to the Queen that it would be impossible for him to form an Administration while Mr. Gladstone, who commanded all that was militant and victorious in the Liberal Party, remained a private member in the terrible character of Free Lance and Candid Friend, like a Cromwell in the army of an Essex. At Her Majesty's bidding, Lord Hartington, that same evening, called on Mr. Gladstone and asked whether he would be willing to take office in a Hartingtonian Administration. The reply was brief and discouraging. No amount of intrigue—and Lord Hartington was no

¹ "Life of W. E. Gladstone," edited by Sir Wemyss Reid.

intriguer—could have formed a Liberal Administration without the victor of Midlothian; and the victor chose to be ‘aut Cæsar aut nullus.’

“On April 23, Lord Hartington and Lord Granville, having visited the Queen together, returned to London in the afternoon and sought out Mr. Gladstone. They found him ‘buttoned to the chin.’ The Cabinet was forming in his mind; Bradshaw was lying on the table. Before dinner-time the veteran statesman had kissed hands on his appointment as First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was Prime Minister of England for the second time. In five days the Cabinet was finally constituted. It was a Cabinet representing all sections of the party, from the followers of the Duke of Argyll to those of Mr. Chamberlain. The *Times*, which had to accommodate itself with unusual rapidity to the swing of the pendulum, consoled itself for the admission of Radicals by the large company of moderate men who had been included in the Cabinet. In their society Mr. Bright might be expected to be reasonable in urging his peculiar views, ‘and even the admission of a younger and more advanced Liberal to the circle need excite no anxiety.’”

While the Cabinet had been in process of formation, there was much discussion as to the positions which would be offered to certain gentlemen, and the claims of Lord Rosebery came in

for special consideration. Scotsmen entirely and Englishmen generally believed that he would be included in the Government. The *Spectator* suggested that he should become Postmaster-General, and that either Lord Dufferin or Lord Rosebery should go to Ireland, where the latter "might there make a court, often gloomy, brilliant and attractive." Again the *Spectator*, having suggested that Sir William Harcourt should be made Chancellor of the Exchequer, remarked, "Lord Rosebery is also inevitable, if only for the immense services he has rendered to Scotland." A Cabinet-making correspondent of the same review thought he would go to the Local Government Board. All the speculators were wrong, however: Lord Rosebery did not take office. He had well earned the reward, and Mr. Gladstone desired that he should join his Ministry. Lord Rosebery, however, declined; the main reason, it is believed, being that he felt that the prominent part he had been taking in the development of Liberal feeling in Scotland would have rendered his acceptance of office liable to misconstruction. The *Times* of April 27, 1880, in a leading article, referring to Scotchmen and the Cabinet, mentioned the fact that the Duke of Argyll entered it as Lord President of the Council, and added: 'Another Scotch peer has been invited to join the Government, but with rare modesty has declined the honour as one too great for his present experience.'

As Lord Rosebery is the first to be asked to enter the Ministry who has not been in a Liberal Ministry before, it is to be regretted that his honourable scruples should have led him to reject the proposal. Some subordinate posts have been declined from motives of a different character. Those to whom they were offered appear to have felt that the composition of the Cabinet was not sufficiently wide and representative to be trusted with the faith which subordinates must place in the superiors whose decisions they must be prepared to support with their votes."

Early in the new Parliament the Eastern Question required attention, and England led the way in the attempt to force Turkey to reforms. The Powers joined in a joint note demanding reforms in Armenia and the settlement of the Montenegrin frontier. The Concert of Europe got its way after a naval demonstration under Admiral Sir Beauchamp Seymour at Eravosa. At home the Parliamentary Session of 1880 was rendered notable by the Bradlaugh controversy. The Employers' Liability Bill, the Ground Game Bill, and the Burials Bill were passed. The Malt Duty was abolished, the Income Tax raised, and a duty of 6s. 3d. per barrel was put on beer. The Irish Land Question caused much discussion, and the throwing out by the House of Lords of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill was

declared by Mr. Justin McCarthy to have been the fountain and origin of the agrarian troubles in Ireland, which led to the Coercion Bill of the following year.

Lord Rosebery took very little part in the proceedings of Parliament in 1880. Outside the House of Lords also he made very few speeches. On December 1, an influential gathering, convened by the Greek Committee, met in Willis Rooms for the purpose of expressing sympathy with the Greek nation, and with the Greeks of Epirus and Thessaly. Lord Rosebery, who, as President of the Committee, occupied the chair, deprecated the idea of Greece engaging in a war with Turkey, concerning the matters then in dispute between the two Powers.

In the House of Lords, on February 22 of the following year, Lord Rosebery made an effective speech in favour of a motion for the opening of museums in London on Sunday ; and on April 14, 1881, he opened an exhibition of loan works at the schoolroom of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, whose rector was the well-known Rev. S. A. Barnett, now Canon Barnett. He spoke appreciatively of the influence exerted by such an exhibition, and referred with satisfaction to the fact that, in a city so large that there was little neighbourly feeling, it had induced many people gladly to lend their art treasures to a neighbourhood with which they were not in the least connected.

On June 13, 1881, the Earl of Fife (now the Duke of Fife) raised the question of the desirability of appointing a Minister for Scotland other than the Lord Advocate. Lord Rosebery spoke in favour of the idea, and said that it was significant in regard to this question that the term "Home Rule" was beginning to be heard in Scotland. The discussion possesses exceptional interest from the fact that it was in this session Lord Rosebery first accepted office, becoming Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, Sir William Harcourt being his chief. It was a somewhat peculiar position, perhaps, for a member of the House of Lords to occupy; and from this period, owing to the fact of his being a Peer, and also perhaps to jealousy of the rapid rise of this young lord, probably dates that "girding at Lord Rosebery" which ever afterwards characterised some men of his own side. Great satisfaction was expressed in Liberal circles generally at Lord Rosebery's acceptance of office; and the feeling in Scotland was one of intense gratification, for it was understood that till some permanent arrangement could be made for a direct representation of Scotland in the Ministry in addition to the Lord Advocate, the Earl of Rosebery was at the Home Office specially to concern himself with Scotch affairs. This he did in the most active and useful way, and soon became popularly known north of the Tweed as "the Minister for Scotland."

Accompanied by Sir William Harcourt, Lord Rosebery went to Scotland later in the year, and addressed a meeting at Glasgow. Several meetings were attended in Scotland, and at one Lord Rosebery spoke of himself as "a backstairs Minister for Scotland." Lord Rosebery wanted a front-stairs Minister, and was later on to be responsible for the creation of a new office specially charged with Scotch business.

This first year in which Lord Rosebery knew the sweets, and also the bitters, of office was a notable one for other matters than those to which reference has already been made. The Coercion Bill had been carried early in the year, after turbulent scenes in the House of Commons, during one of which forty Irish members, including Mr. Parnell, were suspended. At the same time Mr. John Morley commenced in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of which he was then editor, an agitation against the policy of Coercion in Ireland. Two days before the Coercion Bill was passed by the Commons there had been received in England the bitter news of the disaster to Sir G. Colley's force at Majuba Hill. The "settlement" of the difficulty with the Boers followed, the "settlement" to which Lord Rosebery subsequently referred as a magnificently magnanimous experiment, as to the results of which, however, he had always had misgivings. In April of that year, on the 19th day, which is now commemorated by the

Conservatives as "Primrose Day," the Earl of Beaconsfield died. The Irish Land Act was passed the same year. The "No Rent" cry had been loudly raised in Ireland, where the agitation was so serious that it drew from Mr. Gladstone, at Leeds, the speech in which he declared that if a final conflict had still to be fought in Ireland, "if the law, purged from defect and from any taint of injustice, is still to be repelled and refused, and the first conditions of political society are to be set at naught, then I say, gentlemen, without hesitation, the resources of civilisation against its enemies are not yet exhausted. I shall recognise in full, when the facts are ripe—and their ripeness is approaching—the drift of the responsibility of the Government. I call upon all orders and degrees of men, not in these two kingdoms, but in these three, to support the Government in the discharge of its duty and in acquitting itself of that responsibility."

The arrest of Mr. Parnell, his imprisonment at Kilmainham, and the suppression of the Land League followed. On October 26, 1881, a great Liberal demonstration took place at Dundee. Lord Rosebery, who was the principal speaker, referred at the outset of his remarks to the fact that since he last appeared on a Scotch platform he had accepted a post under Government. He asserted that the policy of the Government was founded on justice and right,



Photo. by Peggott.]

MENTMORE TOWERS.

and was intelligible to the people. Combating the statement that Mr. Gladstone owed his power to Mr. Parnell, he defied any one to find one sentence in the Midlothian speeches touching on the Land League or on Home Rule, but in terms of the strongest condemnation. A few days later (November 3), he addressed a mass meeting at Greenock, and maintained that the gloomy heritage of doubt and uncertainty bequeathed to the country by the late Government had departed since the advent of the Gladstone Government to office. On December 8 of the same year Lord Rosebery spoke at Hull, and, while admitting the serious state of affairs in Ireland, claimed that nevertheless on the whole the Liberal party had made an advance in the effort to reunite Ireland.

During this year the Earl and Countess of Rosebery had taken a lease of Lansdowne House, where during the season they gave a number of brilliant parties. The house became the central gathering-place for the Liberals of the country of all classes. Lady Rosebery was always the kindest and most gracious hostess. Lord Rosebery welcomed all who were working in the Liberal cause, and the political gatherings there became for that and some succeeding years a constant subject of reference in the journals of the day. Mr. Gladstone was frequently to be met there, and during the years of his second administration Mr. Gladstone with his wife spent a great deal

of time with the Earl and Countess of Rosebery, often staying at the Durdans, Epsom, for the week-ends. No doubt this pleasant retreat so near London largely helped the Premier to bear the worries of these anxious years, when Ireland was causing so much anxiety ; and no doubt the close association with Mr. Gladstone was a cause of much comfort to Lord Rosebery, who was holding office under the exasperation of attacks by those who supported him, yet later were to cause him to retire from the position at the Home Office which he was then occupying. The year 1882 was mainly notable for the Irish Question, regarding which important developments were taking place. Mr. Gladstone got into touch with Mr. Parnell, and his views regarding Ireland appear to have changed in a marked manner from that time. Negotiations proceeded. Messrs. Parnell, Dillon and O'Kelly were released from Kilmainham in May. The Coercion Act was on the point of expiration and Mr. Parnell had promised Mr. Gladstone that he would use his influence in the suppression of outrages. On the release of the Irish members named, Lord Cowper and Mr. Forster resigned their respective offices of Viceroy and Chief Secretary for Ireland. They were succeeded by Lord Spencer and Lord Frederick Cavendish. On May 5 the new officials left England for Ireland, and on the day following came the dreadful tragedy in Phoenix Park, where

Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, the permanent Under Secretary, were murdered. Two days afterwards Mr. Gladstone gave notice of the coming introduction of the Crimes Bill. He had refused to accept the proffered resignation by Mr. Parnell of his seat in Parliament. The Irish leader had offered to take that course immediately on the reception of the news of the Phoenix Park tragedy, which he had described as "the deadliest blow which it was in their power to deal against his hopes in connection with the new course on which the Government had just entered." From that time, however, the Government's task in Ireland was less hard, and the conditions there began to improve. While the state of affairs there in 1882 had been so deplorable, the Government, however, had the satisfaction of seeing some progress made in the carrying out of the provisions of the Berlin Treaty. The delimitation of the Greek frontier was completed, and Mr. Gladstone was able to say at Leeds: "I rejoice to say that, though no progress whatever had been made eighteen months ago in the fulfilment of that purpose, a country famous in history, the country of Thessaly, inhabited from end to end by members of the Greek race, to which in old times we have owed so much—that country of Thessaly has been handed out of servitude into freedom, by the influence exerted by the Powers of Europe, to which you have

contributed your full share. And never, gentlemen, in the course of my life have I enjoyed a purer pleasure than in witnessing the accomplishment of that work, the removal of that yoke, the re-establishment of that union among Greek populations of different regions, without the effusion of one single drop of blood."

On October 20, 1882, a Liberal demonstration took place at Ayr. Lord Rosebery, responding to a resolution of confidence in the Ministry, cast some good-humoured ridicule on a suggestion recently made that four-fifths of the intellectual ability, and five-sixths of the literary ability of the country were ranged upon the side of the Conservatives, and spoke in a congratulatory vein of the popularity enjoyed by the Government.

Many things happened in the following year. Lord Rosebery was active in Parliament and the country, and in addition to making numerous speeches, he laid down the responsibility of office and proceeded on a trip round the world. In the House of Lords, on March 6, 1883, he spoke in support of the Payment of Wages in Public Houses Prohibition Bill, saying that the facts in favour of the Bill were overwhelming. On March 23, 1883, Mr. John Bright was presented with the freedom of the city of Glasgow. Lord Rosebery was present at the function, and, in response to calls from the audience, spoke in eulogistic terms of Mr. Bright, and expressed regret that the latter

had felt obliged to resign his post in the Government during the previous year. On March 30, as President of the Birmingham Junior Liberal Association, he delivered his Presidential Address to a crowded meeting held in the Town Hall of Birmingham, which town he then visited for the first time. The address was for the most part a reply to a speech of Lord Salisbury, delivered the previous day in Birmingham. In the course of the speech he referred to the fact that Birmingham then "was recognised as the shrine of English Liberalism." Elsewhere references have been made to the deep interest taken by Lord Rosebery in social questions. On June 1, 1883, he gave practical evidence of this by the introduction into the House of Lords of a Bill for the protection of young girls. He referred to the fact that in 1881, in consequence of certain facts which had been brought under public notice, a Select Committee of the House, under the presidency of Earl Cairns, had been appointed to consider this question. In this Bill the recommendations of the Committee had been closely followed. The proposal was discussed frequently, hundreds of petitions in its favour were sent to Parliament, numerous amendments to Lord Rosebery's proposals were made, but the Bill was passed, and was sent to the House of Commons on July 5, and subsequently found its place in the Statute-book.

In May Lord Rosebery, Lord Granville, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. John Morley were the principal speakers at the inaugural banquet of the National Liberal Club, held on the 2nd of that month at the Royal Aquarium, when eighteen hundred and fifty gentlemen sat down to dinner. Lord Granville occupied the chair. Mr. Gladstone was the first president of the Club.

Lord Rosebery, proposing the Liberalism of the Future, ventured to mention two features which he believed would characterise the Liberal party of the future. In the first place he believed that the breath of Liberal nostrils was popular sympathy. He believed that the Liberal party could never get on without popular sympathy. The other feature to which he would refer was this: that the future of the Liberal party would depend upon union. It was a truism to say that if the Liberal party was united it need fear no foe. He ventured to say that if the party was at peace with itself and was in the full enjoyment of popular sympathy it must always predominate in this country. The nation knew that the principles of the Liberal party were founded on truth, on peace, and on justice between man and man. It was for that reason that the future of the Liberal party was the future of this country and of the Anglo-Saxon race, and for that reason, if for no other, upon it depended the fairest hopes of the well-being and the happiness of the rest of mankind. With

those remarks he proposed the toast, coupling with it the name of Mr. John Morley, "who, as entering on a new political career, with an active present and a brilliant past, fitly symbolised the future of the Liberal party."

It was very shortly after that gathering that the surprise came of Lord Rosebery's resignation of the office of Under-Secretary at the Home Office. It caused a good deal of comment, and explanations were sought for and given in Parliament. The real explanation only became clear in later years. To go back to the time when Lord Rosebery accepted the office, it is seen that on August 24, 1881, in the House of Commons, in answer to Mr. A. Elliott, Sir William Harcourt had explained the new arrangements made at the Home Office. He said the relations of the Lord Advocate with the political departments of the State remained what they had always been. The Secretary was, as he always had been, responsible for the administration of Scotch affairs. In discharging that function he necessarily required the assistance of officials specially versed in the business of that part of the United Kingdom. That business involved a variety of detail, consisting partly of legal questions, partly of administrative matters, with which members of the Bar had no special acquaintance, such as county borough business, highways, poor law, local taxation, asylums, fisheries, education, prisons, mines, factories, etc. It was

found necessary to give the Secretary of State further assistance in dealing with matters of this description by the appointment in the Home Office of some one who could have leisure to devote himself particularly to this class of business. It was not to be considered that in providing this additional aid for the Secretary of State any political change had been made in the functions or authority belonging to the office of Lord Advocate. The Lord Advocate would continue to take a principal part in the conduct of Scotch business in the House of Commons.

“It was to undertake the work thus described by Sir William Harcourt that Lord Rosebery accepted office, and he fulfilled the duties thoroughly, and greatly to the good of Scotland. When the news of his resignation of the office became known there was much anxiety as to the future of Scotch business. In the House of Commons on Thursday, June 7, 1883, Mr. A. Elliott asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to his statement in the House of Commons on August 24, 1881, and to the recent resignation of Lord Rosebery, he could state to the House the nature of the rearrangements contemplated in the administration of Scotch business, and when they were likely to be given effect to.

Mr. Dalrymple also asked, with reference to Lord Rosebery's connection with the management

of Scotch affairs, if the arrangement was described at the time as giving additional assistance at the Home Office, and whether the right honourable gentleman was correctly reported to have stated that the arrangement never was intended to be permanent, and was only intended to propitiate Scotch members, and whether that statement had anything to do with Lord Rosebery's resignation.

Sir William Harcourt replied: "I am very glad indeed to answer the latter question before that of the honourable member. I intended to ask the House to be allowed to make a personal statement on the subject. Statements have been made, and apparently received with credence by the honourable member opposite, that something I had said or done had been taken amiss by Lord Rosebery, and had conduced, in some manner, to his resignation. All I have to say on my part—and I am desired to say it on behalf of Lord Rosebery—is that there is not a word of foundation for it. It is an entirely untrue statement, which has not a colour of foundation of any kind or sort. As to the relations between Lord Rosebery and myself, they have been for many years, and, I am happy to say, are still, those of the closest political friendship and personal affection" (a remark which *The Times* report shows to have been received with laughter), "which has never been disturbed for a single moment. I do not know for what purpose

statements of this character are made. I suppose they are intended to give pain. If so, they have succeeded in their object, but I am happy to have the opportunity of saying that they are entirely without foundation. Lord Rosebery wrote to me this morning: 'I know what you must be feeling under so undeserved an innuendo, but I am quite as indignant as you are.' I do not think I need say anything more," continued Sir William Harcourt, "on the personal part of the question. As regards the other matter to which the honourable member opposite alludes, what I said the other night I said with perhaps too light a manner, but I had hoped that the language I had used would have been understood in the sense in which it was employed. It is perfectly accurate that when Lord Rosebery was good enough to consent to take the office of Under-Secretary of State to the Home Department he took it as a temporary arrangement, and it was so understood by the Government, and so understood by Lord Rosebery and myself, for the purpose of facilitating the conduct of Scotch business, and it was understood that it was at the desire of Scotch members. That arrangement was made in order to meet these views. I explained, in my answer to my honourable friend the member for Roxburgh, exactly what had passed, and stated that it was in order to give greater assistance in what I may call the lay, as distinguished from the professional,

business of Scotland. It was never intended that the arrangements, which had obvious inconveniences, should be permanently established, nor was it the desire or the view of Lord Rosebery that it should be so. On the contrary, he always desired that there should be a different and more permanent arrangement in reference to Scotch business. It was prolonged beyond our expectations, though not beyond my wishes, because I think it was my personal urgency to Lord Rosebery which induced him to continue to perform those functions longer than was originally intended. Lord Rosebery has always had at heart some permanent and regular arrangement with reference to Scotch business. In that the Government have concurred, and they have already announced that a plan of that kind will be introduced. My honourable friend has asked me to state the details of that arrangement. Being necessarily considerable, they are being worked out, with the assistance of the Lord Advocate, Lord Rosebery, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I hope we shall have an early opportunity of presenting it to the House.

Sir W. Harcourt later on said the Secretary of State (himself) would attend to the business.

Shortly afterwards Mr. Gladstone, in reply to a resolution from the General Committee of the Scottish Liberal Club in connection with Lord Rosebery's resignation, wrote that "he fully

shared the regret expressed by the Committee in this matter, and he joined in their hope that Lord Rosebery's abilities might before long be again turned to account in active public service."

It is a serious thing to be a lord, if you are also a Liberal leader. Peers must not take part in elections; they cannot be elected to Parliament themselves. If some people had their way it would be impossible for a peer to be anything that is useful, however anxious he may be to serve his Queen and country, however great his capacities, however earnest his desire to use them in the public service. Such feelings have been amusingly referred to by Mr. J. M. Barrie.¹ In "An Edinburgh Eleven" Mr. Barrie deals first with Lord Rosebery, of whom he tells some excellent anecdotes. To recount one or two will brighten a rather gloomy page of the Earl's public career. Mr. Barrie says: "One day at Edinburgh he realised the disadvantage of owning swift horses. His brougham had met him at Waverley station to take him to Dalmeny. Lord Rosebery opened the door of the carriage to put in some papers, and then turned away. The coachman, thinking his master was inside, drove off. After going seven miles he reached a point in Dalmeny Park where it was his lordship's custom to alight and open a gate. The Earl, not being there, did not of course alight as usual.

¹ "An Edinburgh Eleven," *British Weekly Extras*, No. 3.

With a quaking hand the coachman, when he discovered his lordship's absence, turned the horses back and looked fearfully along the sides of the road. He met Lord Rosebery travelling in great good-humour by the luggage omnibus."

Mr. Barrie also tells a good story of the Earl and Prince Bismarck: "Lord Rosebery had once a conversation with Prince Bismarck, to which, 'owing to some oversight,' as Mr. Barrie facetiously remarks, the Paris correspondent of the *Times* was not invited. M. Blowitz only smiled good-naturedly, and of course his report of the proceedings appeared all the same. Some time afterwards Lord Rosebery was introduced to this remarkable man, 'who, as is well known, carries Cabinet appointments in his pockets,' and complimented him on his report. 'Ah, it was all right, was it?' asked Blowitz, beaming. Lord Rosebery explained that the only fault it had was that it was all wrong. 'Then if Bismarck did not say that to you,' said Blowitz, regally, 'I know he intended to say it.'"

Mr. Barrie, however, commences the sketch from which these anecdotes are taken with this statement: "The first time I ever saw Lord Rosebery was in Edinburgh when I was a student, and I flung a clod of earth at him. He was a peer; those were my politics. I missed him, and I have heard a good many journalists say since then that he is a difficult man to hit."

Unconsciously Mr. Barrie did, however, hit a mark there. He struck upon the real reason why Lord Rosebery left the Home Office. "He is a peer: fling a clod at him." That is what many men, who would not have been great, whether born peasants or peers, have been doing to Lord Rosebery for years. In those early days of his first experiences of office, he was having clods flung at him because he was a peer. It was not his fault—and it has ever been his great regret—that he could not sit in the House of Commons. It is probably not going too far to say that he would never have resigned the leadership of the Liberal party, which was afterwards his place, had he possessed the privilege of leading in the House of Commons instead of being forced to occupy a place in the "Gilded Chamber," from which it was impossible for him to attack his political opponents, to defend himself from them and from the veiled attacks of some who ought to have been his loyal supporters. That it was because he was a peer, and for nothing else, he gave up the Home Office appointment, Lord Rosebery made quite clear when, eleven years later, to a great meeting held at the St. James's Hall, on March 21, 1894, he was able to speak to the people "as one of their elected representatives" for the London County Council. On that occasion, referring to his tenure of office at the Home Department, he said :

"It was then found that that office was a dangerous one to be entrusted to a peer, and, under the pressure of public opinion, overwhelming as I understand on that subject, I had to relinquish it. It was then I took a solemn determination I would never relinquish another office on that objection."

Lord Rosebery had then his first experience of a "cave," and gave up a post which he liked, and in which he had been responsible for a vast amount of most useful administrative work. He was so impressed with the value of the labour which had to be performed, that he persisted in his efforts to secure a special Scotch appointment in the Ministry, and the Government presented a Bill for the purpose. On July 21, 1883, Lord Rosebery was presented with the freedom of the City of Edinburgh. In acknowledging the honour, he addressed himself to stating the case in favour of a Bill introduced by the Government, providing for the establishment of a Scotch Local Government Board, with a Minister for Scotland at its head. Frequent efforts were made to proceed with the measure, but it was not for that session, nor for that Government, to see the matter through. Yet—and the conclusion of the matter may conveniently be introduced here—Lord Rosebery in the next Parliament, on July 9, 1885, moved the second reading of the Secretary for Scotland Bill, when he remarked :

“My lords, as regards this measure there are only three changes from the time last year when it was dropped by Her Majesty's late Government; and this leads me to remark on the extraordinary sinister influence which this measure appears to have exercised on the deliberations of this House. On the first occasion on which it was brought forward it was in a very much smaller shape than it is now, and it then arrived too late to be discussed by the majority of this House. On the second occasion it passed through committee, and was down for a third reading on the very day on which Her Majesty's late Government had to announce that they could proceed with no further measures. And this year it came on for a second reading on the very day on which it was the duty of Her Majesty's late Government to announce in the language which is suitable to the occasion that they had sent a confidential communication to Her Majesty. My lords, a bill which has survived such difficulties is destined to float, and I do not think that anything can now wreck it.”

The Bill found much support, some peers, however, strongly objecting to education being included.

Lord Salisbury said no doubt the Bill should properly have been a Government measure; and in the House of Commons, if their lordships passed it, it would be a Government measure.

Looking to the conspicuous manner in which Lord Rosebery had been connected with the movement, the Government had thought it would be rather ungracious to take the measure out of his hands.

Matters relating to law would not, Lord Rosebery explained, be placed under the new department; the office of Keeper of the Great Seal would be added to it, to add to the dignity of office; and primary education would be placed under the control of the Secretary. He believed these changes commended themselves to Scottish feeling.

The Bill was passed by both Houses, and soon afterwards became law. It is the 48 and 49 Vict., Ch. 61, and its provisions are:

“An Act for appointing a Secretary for Scotland and Vice-President of the Scotch Education Department. [14th August, 1885.]

“Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

“1. This Act may be cited as the Secretary for Scotland Act, 1885.

“2. It shall be lawful for Her Majesty to appoint a Secretary for Scotland (hereinafter called the Secretary), who shall hold office during Her Majesty's pleasure.

“ There shall be paid to the Secretary, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, a salary of two thousand pounds a year.

“ The Secretary may appoint such permanent secretaries, inspectors, clerks, and other officers as he may with the sanction of the Treasury determine.

“ The salaries of such secretaries and other officers of the Secretary's office shall be fixed with the consent of the Treasury, and shall, together with such other expenses of the said office as may from time to time be sanctioned by the Treasury, be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament.

“ 3. The Secretary, if not a member of the House of Lords, shall, if otherwise qualified, be capable of being elected to and of voting in the Commons House of Parliament, and the office of Secretary shall be deemed to be an office included in Schedule H. of the Representation of the People Act, 1867; in Schedule H. of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868; in Schedule E. of the Representation of the People (Ireland) Act, 1868; and in Part First of the schedule of the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, as regards England.

“ 4. The Secretary may adopt an official seal, and describe himself generally by the style and title of “ The Secretary for Scotland.”

“ A rule, or order, or regulation made by the

Secretary shall be valid if it is made under the seal of the Secretary and signed by him or by any secretary or other officer appointed by him for that purpose; and the production of a copy of such rule, order, or regulation, purporting to be certified to be true by any secretary or other officer appointed by him for that purpose, shall, unless the contrary is shown, be a sufficient proof that any such rule, order, or regulation of the Secretary was duly made.

“5.—(1.) All powers and duties vested in or imposed on one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State by the enactments specified in Part I. of the Schedule to this Act, and all powers and duties vested in or imposed on one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State in relation to the Universities of Scotland;

“(2.) All powers and duties vested in or imposed on the Privy Council by the enactments specified in Part II. of the said Schedule;

“(3.) All powers and duties vested in or imposed on the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury by the enactments specified in Part III. of the said Schedule, or the Local Government Board for England by the enactments specified in Part IV. of the said Schedule, so far as such duties and powers relate to Scotland, shall, on and after the appointment of the Secretary, be transferred to, vested in, and imposed on the Secretary.

“Any report, act, or thing required or authorised

by the said enactments, or any of them, to be made or done to the said Secretary of State, or Privy Council or any committee thereof, or the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, or the Local Government Board for England, and any report required to be made to Her Majesty by virtue of any of the said enactments, shall, so far as such enactments apply to Scotland, from and after the appointment of the said Secretary, be made to or be done by or to the Secretary.

“6. It shall be lawful for Her Majesty from time to time, by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual, to appoint the Secretary for Scotland to be Vice-President of the Scotch Education Department; and the Scotch Education Department shall mean the Lords of any Committee of the Privy Council appointed by Her Majesty on Education in Scotland.

“7. From and after the appointment of the Vice-President of the Scotch Education Department as hereinbefore provided, all powers and duties vested in or imposed on the Scotch Education Department constituted under the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, shall, be transferred to, vested in, and imposed on the Scotch Education Department constituted under this Act; and wherever in any Act of Parliament, minute, or regulation, reference is made to the Scotch Education Department, such reference shall be read and construed as applying to the Scotch

Education Department constituted under this Act.

“8. The Secretary shall have the place, trust, and office of Keeper of Her Majesty's Seal, appointed by the Treaty of Union to be kept and made use of in Scotland in place of the Great Seal of Scotland, with all such powers, privileges, and liberties as do by law and custom belong to the same.

“9. Nothing in this Act contained shall prejudice or interfere with any rights, powers, privileges, or duties vested in or imposed on the Lord Advocate by virtue of any Act of Parliament or custom.”

CHAPTER XIV

A TOUR ROUND THE WORLD—THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES—MOTHER AND DAUGHTER COUNTRIES—"A MARRIAGE OF THE AFFECTIONS"—BASIS OF EMPIRE—"THE PASSION OF MY LIFE"—A BUSY AUTUMN—GREAT SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT—THE FRANCHISE BILL—REDISTRIBUTION—RELATIONS OF LORDS AND COMMONS—INDEPENDENT PEERS AND "RECKLESS DEMAGOGUES"—AN URGENT APPEAL

LORD ROSEBERY, freed from the worries of office, was able to take the tour round the world which he had long desired to enjoy. His wife accompanied him. The children, of whom there were four, were left in the care of Lady Leconfield, their aunt. The two eldest children were girls—Lady Sybil and Lady Hannah. The heir had been born at Lansdowne House on January 8, 1882. He was christened at the Chapel Royal, St. James's, Lady Lansdowne being godmother and the Prince of Wales a godfather. The names given were Albert Edward Harry Meyer Rothschild. The fourth child was also a boy, born on December 14, 1882, at Dalmeny, and christened Neil James Archibald.

Lord and Lady Rosebery, immediately after the Earl's resignation, made the necessary arrangements, and soon left England on a trip which

was one of the most delightful periods of their life together. They went first to America, where their doings from day to day were recorded in detail in the daily newspapers. They went everywhere and saw everything worth seeing, and met many distinguished people there. Mines, workhouses, orphanages, hospitals, and municipal buildings were inspected. Racecourses were visited. To the Earl, especially, who was ever a student of men, the trip was instructive as well as pleasant, for he took care to inform himself intimately on the social conditions of the workers in the countries visited, and of the manner in which social and industrial problems were being dealt with abroad. Part of September and October were spent on the American continent, and then they sailed from San Francisco for Australia, which was reached early in December. From Sydney they proceeded to Melbourne, which was reached on December 12, Mr. Service, the Premier, receiving the Earl and Countess at the railway station, and taking them afterwards to Government House. In Australia they received the most cordial and enthusiastic welcome. The popularity of Lord Rosebery in the home country was well-known to the Australian people, who, by means of a press as distinguished, honourable and capable as that of England, were thoroughly familiar with the work he had done in England, and with all questions

concerning politics at home and the relations of the home Government with the Colonies. Lord Rosebery was regarded, consequently, as one whose sympathies with the Colonies were assured. Shortly after his arrival the Highland Society gave a banquet in his honour at Sydney, and the company received from Lord Rosebery the assurance that he and the Liberal party understood the feelings and sympathised with the aspirations of the Australian Colonies, for whom the Earl predicted a brilliant future.

Australia has always been largely interested in sport, and the presence of Lord Rosebery at cricket matches, and at the Royal Victoria Club's race meeting at Flessington, were greatly appreciated. The Earl visited mines, museums, libraries. A visit was paid on the last day of the year to Sandhurst. There the Earl saw the Garden Gully mine, and had explained to him the various processes of extracting the gold from the quartz. He was presented with a souvenir of the visit in the form of a piece of golden quartz well laminated with minerals. At a luncheon afterwards he commented upon the great advantages the industrial workers in Australia enjoyed over their brethren at home.

On January 9, 1884, he was entertained at the banquet given by Mr. C. Smith, Mayor of Melbourne. Other chief guests were the Marquis of Normanby and Sir William Des Vœux. Mr.

Service, the Premier, was present. Lord Rosebery on that occasion delivered what the *Melbourne Argus* described as "a pleasing and graceful address, which is of value as indicating what will be done by the noble lord in the inevitable discussion of the Australian questions in England." Another comment of the newspaper named ran: "One of the great difficulties of the day in England, Lord Rosebery remarked, is to restore the local government which has been lost—a remark which, it may be presumed, must be taken as indicating not that the Earl of Rosebery is ready to throw up the cap for Home Rule in Ireland, but that he approves of Mr. Chamberlain's plan of easing the work of the Imperial Parliament by establishing county boards. . . . Lord Rosebery earned rapturous applause by his declaration that as the result of his tour it will become a passion with him to lend whatever aid he can to the preservation of the union of the Empire. When he had finished, the audience could understand why, apart from his friendship for Mr. Gladstone, the Earl of Rosebery holds a high position in Imperial politics, and is regarded with hope as a coming man."

Writing of this now, when Federation of the Australian Colonies has been brought about, and when the test of war has been applied to the affection of the colonists for the mother country, it is interesting to quote from Lord Rosebery's

speech on that occasion a few sentences which show how in this, as in other matters, Lord Rosebery has accurately gauged the feelings of the people and the true spirit of Empire. He remarked: "I have heard a dread murmur that if federation took place, and if Australia became a dominion as Canada is, there would be some danger of Australasia desiring to separate from the Mother Country. I only mention that as an argument which has been used. Now, I don't profess to define for one moment what is the basis on which the British Empire rests. I do not believe that such a conglomeration has ever been seen since the world began, and I don't believe that any one here or outside this room can give any satisfactory account to the logical mind of the basis on which that Empire rests, because it is not a matter of compact or of civil contract. The connection between Great Britain and her colonies is a marriage of the affections, or it is nothing at all. It has been said very lately by a writer who has visited Australia, Mr. Forbes, and who is entitled to great weight on his own account, that the connection of Australia with the mother country would not survive a war. I have naturally no experience, nor have you, to judge whether that is so or not. But my belief is that the connection of loyalty between Australia and the mother country would survive a war, and would survive, as long as other things were equal,

as long as the home country and the daughter country were allowed to preserve their positions of mutual independence and mutual self-respect. I believe that if those conditions are observed, the connection of the colonies—and I am speaking of Australia more particularly—will become closer and not looser than before. . . . There is an old tradition—I don't know if it remains good—that in the British Royal dockyards every rope that is manufactured, from the largest cable to the smallest twine, has a single red thread through it which pervades the whole strand, and which, if unpacked, destroys the whole rope. That was a sign of the Royal production of those ropes. Although I distrust metaphors, I believe that that metaphor holds good to some extent of the British Empire. It is held together by this single red line, and that red line is the union of races. When I say the union of races, I mean to imply the community of memories, of work, of object and of aim which is implied by the communion of races. I have always hoped that that communion of races might exist as long as my life lasted ; but since my visit to Australia it will become a passion with me to endeavour to preserve that union, and to serve this country of Australia, of which I can never have any but the most happy and delightful memories." Lord Rosebery in the course of his speech expressed great regret that he and the Countess would be unable during the

tour to pay the visit to New Zealand which they had hoped for.

Before leaving Australia Lord Rosebery wrote a letter to the widow of Mr. Marcus Clarke, in relation to the memorial volume to that talented writer, which was then in preparation, the book being compiled and edited by Hamilton Mackinnon, and "respectfully dedicated by Marian Clarke to Lord Rosebery, in grateful remembrance of his kindness to her and her children." The letter ran :

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE, MELBOURNE, *January 16, 1884.*

"MRS. MARCUS CLARKE.

"DEAR MADAM,—I am honoured by your request that I should allow the memorial volume of your husband's works to be dedicated to me. I am very chary about dedications, because I never feel I deserve them. But this one, perhaps, I am least unworthy of, and therefore, if you think that my name can be of the slightest service to the book, pray make use of it as you please.

"I say that I am not wholly unworthy of this honour, and for this reason. I think, perhaps, that of those who live in England, I am one of the oldest and warmest of your husband's admirers—so warm that I remember, when I read of his death, feeling that my visit to Australia (which has always been a floating dream of mine) would lose one great attraction to me in his absence.

Long ago I fell upon 'His Natural Life' by accident, and read it, not once or twice, but many times, at different periods. Since then I have frequently given away copies to men whose opinions I valued, and have always received from them the same opinion as to the extraordinary power of the book.

"There can, indeed, I think, be no two opinions as to the horrible fascination of the book. The reader who takes it up and gets beyond the Prologue—which is for many reasons the least satisfactory, albeit a very necessary part of the narrative—although he cannot but be harrowed by the long agony of the story and the human anguish of every page, is unable to lay it down: almost in spite of himself he has to read and suffer to the bitter end. To me, I confess, it is the most terrible of all novels, more terrible than 'Oliver Twist' or Victor Hugo's most startling effects, for the simple reason that it is more real. It has all the solemn ghastliness of truth.

"Since I have been in Australia I have employed some of the little time at my disposal in carefully examining the blue books on which 'His Natural Life' is founded, and during my recent visit to Tasmania I made some personal inquiries on the subject. The result has been to bring conviction to my mind that the case is not one whit overstated—nay, that the fact in some particulars is more frightful than the fiction.

Perhaps the most appalling chapter in the book is that which describes the escape and cannibalism of Gabbett, yet this is taken with almost verbal accuracy from the narrative of the escape of Pearce and Cox from Macquarie Harbour, in the appendix of the Transportation Report of 1837-8. That this should be so only enhances, to my mind, the merit of the book.

“The materials for great works of imagination lie all around us; but it is genius that selects and transposes them.

“I fancy that your husband's works are not sufficiently appreciated in Australia, and am sure they are insufficiently appreciated in Great Britain. It is not, perhaps, wonderful as regards Great Britain, but it is certainly wonderful (if it be true) as regards Australia. For it is rare, I think, that so young a country has produced so great a literary force. I cannot believe but that the time must soon come when Australians will feel a melancholy pride in this true son of genius, and Australian genius; while as they read his greatest work (written when he was but twenty-five) they cannot but be thrilled at the thought that the bright present they enjoy is separated by so narrow an interval of time from the infernal tragedy portrayed by him. And in England you may find that—like another power in the world of letters, not dissimilar in genius, I mean Emily Brontë—he may have made up to him in

posthumous honour what was lacking in his lifetime.

“ In any case, I rejoice at the publication of a volume of those smaller pieces of your husband's which are out of print ; and I hope to see at no distant date a cheaper edition of ‘ His Natural Life,’ so as to bring it within the reach of the great mass of the reading public.

“ I am writing in haste, as in an hour or two I leave Melbourne on my way home ; so I will only ask you to believe me to be,

“ Sincerely yours,

“ ROSEBERY.”

The book embraces a great variety of writings, and it is amusing to note that it even includes the political song,—

Learn the lore of Mill and May,
And nerve your souls for politics,—

with the chorus—

Politics, politics, that's the trade,—
Turn 'em out, keep 'em out,
Fortune's made.
Robberies ! Jobberies, many be,
No Robbing like the Jobbing of the Treasury.

Before returning to England, Lord and Lady Rosebery visited India, where also they had a most hearty welcome. Then their faces were turned homeward, where Lord Rosebery with

renewed vigour was to return almost immediately to the political arena, and commence one of the most active periods of his life, both in Parliament and the country. In many of his speeches subsequently to the tour abroad, it was evident that the visit to the distant parts of the British possessions had given him a greater idea of the power and possibilities of the Empire. He was in his place in the House of Lords soon after his return. On June 20 he moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider the best means of promoting the efficiency of the House of Lords. He suggested a few points that might be subjects of consideration for such a committee, and expressed the opinion that the nation would regard with great satisfaction the spectacle of the House of Lords endeavouring to remodel itself without outward pressure. It was the duty of the members of the House to make it as powerful as possible, and to this end reform was essential.

Lord Granville on this occasion said he thought there ought to be some specific proposals if such a committee were to be appointed—a view which was generally endorsed by Lord Salisbury. After a debate, in which a number of peers took part, the motion was negatived by seventy-seven votes to thirty-eight.

On February 29, 1884, Mr. Gladstone had introduced into the House of Commons the

County Franchise Bill, by which the qualifications in counties were to be assimilated to those in boroughs, and two millions of voters were to be added to the electorate. At first uncompromising resistance was offered by the Conservatives. Their attitude was, however, considerably modified afterwards, and they contented themselves with the demand that a Redistribution Bill should also be introduced as a consequence of the measure. On June 26 the third reading of the Bill was carried. Mr. Gladstone at the time quoted, as a warning to the House of Lords, the advice of Polonius to his son: "Beware of entrance to a quarrel; but, being in, bear 't that the opposer may beware of thee." So the Bill went to the Lords, and on July 8, 1884, Lord Rosebery delivered a great speech in support of its second reading. The effort was admitted even by his opponents to be one of the finest he had ever made. The reference in the early remarks to Lord Brabourne had a peculiar sting, for that peer was one of those most recently created by Mr. Gladstone, against whose party in the House of Lords he had constantly voted after taking his seat in the Upper House.

Lord Rosebery said:

"I cannot but regret the extreme anguish which the noble lord (Brabourne) described himself as feeling at being obliged on this occasion to vote in a different lobby from Her Majesty's Government.

When I remember how frequently this has unfortunately been the case, I can only look on the noble lord's coronet as a crown of thorns; because, ever since he has had a seat in this House, it has been his consistent and miserable fate to vote against Her Majesty's Government. The noble lord said he could not bear to shut the door on these two millions whom the Bill proposes to enfranchise; but I can comfort him by the assurance that he will not shut the door upon them, because, whatever the vote of this evening may be—and I regret, from certain ominous signs on the benches opposite, that it will not be favourable to the cause I espouse—the result of to-night's division will not be to reject, but only to retard the great measure of emancipation now before your lordships.

“I am glad to hear the cheers that come from the benches opposite, and I will ask noble lords to consider whether the retarding of a measure of this sort, in the way it is sought to retard it, is altogether the most just and practicable method of proceeding? As far as I can gather from the debate, there is no difference of opinion whatever as to the merits of the Bill which is before your lordships; and what seems to be the unfortunate part of the case is, that, having arrived at this unanimous opinion, your lordships are equally resolved, by a powerful majority, to reject the Bill. Outside this House there are a great many

rude, honest, simple, ignorant people who are unable, and will be unable, to understand how that state of things has arisen.

“We on this side do not regard this merely as a measure of expediency; we regard it as a measure of expediency, it is true, but we regard it as a measure of justice as well—a long-deferred measure of high justice to give this boon to two millions of our fellow-countrymen. But with us it is not only a question of expediency and justice, it is a question of possibility. I venture to say that any one who has regarded the state of business in the House of Commons during the last few years will see it would have been a matter of impossibility to attempt to pass a Redistribution Bill in connection with the Franchise Bill. The noble Earl, the Secretary for the Colonies, touched on this point in his able speech to-night, and referred to the delay of debate in the other House. Every member whose seat would have been affected by the measure of redistribution would have been able to raise a distinct discussion on the point, and you will see in this one measure of redistribution, there would have been opportunities for obstruction which could not have been resisted.

“There is the case of Ireland. Some maintain that it is over-represented; some maintain that the over-representation is not so great as to make it worth interfering with; some maintain that its

distance from London justifies a larger measure of representation for Ireland than is given to other parts of the United Kingdom. But every one of these questions would be raised on the first breath of a measure of redistribution, and, what is more, you will have the whole question of justice to Ireland, which has been so predominant a question for the last four years, raised.

“Then there is the case of Scotland. The case of Scotland is not so clamant as that of Ireland; but Scotland demands and claims a larger representation, and we may be sure that the flock of faithful sheep who come from Scotland would not be very willing that their claim should be overlooked. And when you come to ask how the addition to Scotland is to be found, you find yourselves face to face with questions of the most vital importance—questions as to how these members are to be obtained—whether by addition to the members of the House of Commons or some other way.

“Then there are the questions of proportional representation, the question of the representation of minorities,—all these are questions which are vital to redistribution. The noble and learned Earl (Cairns) enumerated these points much better than I can do; but a strange thing in his argument was this, that he had drawn from this enumeration a conclusion the very opposite of that

which I draw. He seemed to think that because there were so many difficulties and perplexities, and so many opportunities of interminable discussion, therefore it was necessary that the Redistribution Bill and the Franchise Bill should be brought in together. There are one or two other points connected with this point of redistribution which the noble and learned Earl has raised. It is said that you are unwilling to make this large addition to the voting power of the country without a large measure of redistribution as well.

“I will test that by a simple argument. The question of redistribution as a part of this Bill was settled on the amendment of the noble Lord the member for Leicestershire (Lord J. Manners) on the second reading of the Bill in the other House. It was then put an end to finally and for ever in the House of Commons by a majority of 130. There was no more question then after that of redistribution forming part of the Franchise Bill. But at the eleventh hour, at the last stage of the Bill, what did the front Opposition bench in the House of Commons do? Led by the right hon. Baronet (Sir S. Northcote), supported by the noble Lord (Lord J. Manners), they brought forward a proposition, and argued it with all the strength in their power, to add five hundred thousand voters to the two million new voters proposed by the Bill—I mean the women

vote—and this without the slightest provision for redistribution.

“The question of redistribution was dead and gone; it was on the shelf; it was hung up, but that did not prevent the front Opposition bench in the House of Commons raising this question. The noble and learned Earl further said that if the Government passed this Bill they might not, after all, from various circumstances, fulfil their pledge to introduce a measure of redistribution next year. I am sure that was not meant as an insult; but I can conceive no greater insult to a body of men like Her Majesty’s Government than the idea that they are coming here with false professions. I tell noble lords opposite that should that breach of pledge arise I would join with them, and half the members on this side of the House would join with them, in any vote of censure they might bring forward for breach of faith.

“But the noble and learned Earl felt a panic for fear the scheme of redistribution should be rejected, and a new Parliament should be elected on the new franchise, which would be so satisfied with the present state of things that it might decline altogether to entertain the question of redistribution. I do not deny that when one is well off one is content to leave things alone. That is perhaps why noble lords on the front Ministerial bench do not listen to the frantic demands that are made on them to appeal to the country by

noble lords opposite. But I do not think the measure that has been introduced will rest entirely on the discretion of Parliament. I think you will find the great constituencies that are unrepresented will take good care that the question of redistribution is not allowed to slumber. I don't think noble Lords need be under any apprehension on this head. If those places would not take care that redistribution was remembered, the great city of London, with five million inhabitants, and the kingdom of Scotland, from which I come, will equally take care that redistribution is not forgotten. I will only say further on this subject: If there were to be an election under this Bill without redistribution, I am in the happy position which is shared by the noble Earl (Dunraven) who spoke last night—I have so much confidence in the great mass of my fellow-countrymen that I am not in the least afraid of their returning a House which would not be worthy of the British House of Commons. That, however, is a question of the individual feeling, and I shall not say anything further upon it.

“The noble and learned Earl (Cairns) and other speakers have reproached the Government because they represented this to be a pressing matter, and yet did not introduce it four years ago. The answer to that seems to me one of the most elementary matters. The present Government

were returned to Parliament with a very complete programme of work to be done. Would it have been wise or possible on their part if they had taken first the part of their programme which alone necessitated a dissolution ?

“ I go now from redistribution to another great stumbling-block which has been raised by noble Lords opposite as one reason why they cannot vote for the Bill. They have not given it in so many words, but they have shown a degree of irritation on the subject which makes me feel that it has a great deal to do with their attitude. I mean the speech of Mr. Gladstone in moving the third reading of this Bill. I venture to say that I do not think any speech ever delivered in Parliament—and I have heard many speeches very much misunderstood—I do not think any speech has been so completely and absolutely misunderstood as the speech of Mr. Gladstone. I venture to say that, so far from being meant in the sense in which it has been taken in this House, that speech was meant in a strictly Conservative sense. There is no one who has the privilege and honour of Mr. Gladstone's acquaintance but knows the essentially Conservative bases on which Mr. Gladstone's political opinions rest, and I venture to say, from what I know of him, and from reading the speech, that that speech was meant not to threaten the House of Lords in the slightest degree, but to prevent a collision between the two

Houses, which no statesman, no Prime Minister, would ever wish to force.

“ But I take it that the policy of the Government in regard to this matter should be taken, not altogether in regard to Mr. Gladstone’s speech, but as a whole ; and I do not think the Government can be accused of any special wish to injure the constitution of this House. No one who was in this House a few weeks ago, when I had the honour of proposing, not a modification of the constitution of this House, not even an external inquiry, but only a Committee of your lordships’ House to inquire into the best means of promoting the efficiency of this House, can forget the conduct of the Government on that occasion. Some of my leaders on the front bench left the House before the division was taken. But there was one noble lord, a member of the Government, who had the courage of his opinions, and who remained in the House, not to support the unfortunate motion which I had the misfortune to bring forward, but to assist in crushing it. Who was that noble lord ? Why, he was the noble lord (the Earl of Kimberley) who moved the second reading of this Bill last night in a speech of singular ability ; and when noble lords profess to tremble at the menaces of Mr. Gladstone, they should recollect the great fund of security afforded them by the front bench. I have not had the privilege of a seat in this House very

long, but I never recollect any important question arising but there was a flutter of this kind amongst your lordships, and it was said that Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Bright had said something which would render it impossible for your lordships to vote according to your consciences or judgments, and that your lordships must exercise a great and wise independence, and show what your lordships think of those reckless demagogues, and how thoroughly independent you are. I venture to think that the highest courage of all is shown, if menaces are offered, by disregarding them, and by taking the course you would have taken if they had never been uttered.

“These are absolutely the only arguments which have been brought forward to support this most abstract resolution which is now under our consideration. It is not contended by anybody, I think, that this matter was not before the constituencies at the last general election. In the Midlothian speeches you will find only one single reference to the county suffrage; but it is an important one. Mr. Gladstone said: ‘The question had been so entirely before the country that it was almost impossible to say anything new about it; but so far as he was concerned, he hoped and believed that it would form one of the earliest measures which a new Liberal Government would undertake’; and I venture to say, when it comes to the fourth session of a new

Parliament, that the Government have faithfully and earnestly redeemed that pledge. The House of Commons has passed the Bill so unanimously that it spent a whole afternoon in discussing whether two or three gentlemen said 'No' in the division on the third reading. And, therefore, considering that the subject was well before the country at the last election, that the Government had an enormous majority, and that the Bill comes up to this House with the almost unanimous voice of the House of Commons, I am utterly at a loss to understand the arguments upon which the noble and learned Earl opposite founds his resolution.

"There is another very important question—a question which I cannot escape from myself, and which has not yet been raised in this debate. It is this: Every member of this House who objects to this Bill has a perfectly indefeasible right to reject it. I am not going to discuss this right so called of the House of Lords, but I do deny that the House of Lords has any moral justification for rejecting this Bill on the second reading. What is our interest in this Bill? We have an interest, as all British subjects have an interest, in this Bill. We have an interest in the good government of the country; but I venture to say that, as regards our interest in the good government of the country, it is materially affected by three considerations. The first is this: If we

had no voters on the register like the voters we are preparing to introduce, I should say there is some validity in the argument; but we have hundreds and thousands of tried and tested voters of the same kind as those we wish to introduce. Therefore we cannot say that this is any reckless experiment in legislation.

“In the next place, I think we should not be justified, if our object is merely to delay, in rejecting the Bill. In the third place, I believe we should have justification, if we were prepared to reject it, as being opposed to all reform, and not merely dictating, as we are prepared to do this evening, the exact order and method of procedure in which the House of Commons has to reform its own constitution. What is our interest in this Bill as compared with another important class of Bills which we are not allowed to touch—I mean money Bills? This House is supposed to represent property; but the House of Commons may pass a legislative measure to-morrow profoundly and injuriously affecting the position and property of every member of this House; they may pass a graduated Income-tax, or they may mortgage the whole property of this country by a recklessly enormous loan; but when a measure comes up to this House embodying these proposals, this House can only bow to it, and accept it. In the year 1860, indeed, there was an appeal made to the right of the House of Lords to reject money

Bills, but I do not think that is a right which is likely to survive the reception which it met with on that occasion. But this is not a matter of money.

“This is a matter that does not concern us directly at all. It concerns us only indirectly. It has occupied and it concerns the House of Commons in the most absolute and direct manner. Let me take a parallel case, and then perhaps you will understand what is the position of the House of Commons. Suppose we were to pass a Bill to reform ourselves, and, passing it by acclamation, with only two or three dissentients, we sent it down to the House of Commons, and that when it reached the House of Commons it was met by a lengthy resolution, and was turned out on the second reading—what would be our feelings in regard to the Bill to reform our own procedure? Yet I cannot see any great difference between the case I have mentioned and the case of the House of Lords with regard to this Bill. You can well meet me with this argument, that the House of Lords in 1831 did reject the Reform Bill of that day; but that is a fatal precedent. Think what a storm it aroused. Think how near we were to the brink of a revolution. But the cases are not at all parallel. The legislation of 1831 was not the completion of a measure of enfranchisement already partly begun. It was a totally new, almost

a revolutionary measure, brought into a House totally unaccustomed to Reform Bills; and it came up to this House as a thing to be duly weighed and considered before it was passed.

"I am not asking you, my lords, to limit your prerogative; but if this House is to be strong it should be founded, not on the letter of the law, but with good sense and on practical considerations. You strengthen your prerogative by narrowing it to what is useful and practical. I do not in the least mean to deny your right to do anything with this Bill that you choose. I think an abstract right is a very useful thing to possess; but surely it is much more useful if it is associated with some power of carrying it into effect.

"And this leads me to ask, What is it that you have the power to effect by passing this resolution, and by what means do you propose to effect it? What is the Archimedean lever by which you propose to dislocate the balance of the world? What is behind you? Are you sure of yourselves? There have been symptoms of weakening even on the benches opposite. I know that in all human probability you will have a majority. The fiery cross has been sent out; the army is there—or thereabouts; and I have no doubt by the time the division is called the army will appear. The noble Duke (Argyll) in the able and eloquent but somewhat abstract

argument which he addressed to your lordships last night, made a spirited defence of the country peers, and drew a picture of them studying politics in their rural retreats, and when the tocsin sounded, hurrying from these rustic retreats redolent of the library and the hayfield, ready to confirm any decision which might be arrived at by the front bench opposite.

“I do not blame the noble lords for non-attendance, but whether we like it or not, by an accident of birth we are compelled to take an interest in politics, and that is why the country peers are summoned to appear in this House on great nights. It does not matter so much what we think of the country peers. What we have to consider is, what is the opinion outside of this House as to the character of these votes? And when you analyse the large majority and find that it is composed of those who have not habitually attended this House, is that a weapon with which you can with any confidence enter into a conflict with the great majority of the country or of the House of Commons?

“What is it that, by the employment of this instrument, good, bad, or indifferent, you hope to gain? You cannot prevent this Bill passing. In fact, we have had a unanimous expression of a wish from every peer who has spoken that he was most anxious that it should pass, but they are under the unfortunate necessity of rejecting it.

My Lords, you cannot prevent this Bill passing. You cannot even turn out the Government. If anything is certain, the one thing certain is, that by this action you will greatly strengthen Her Majesty's Government. Whatever misfortunes or mistakes they may have had—and there have been something like half a dozen votes of censure proposed in this session—you pass a wet sponge over the slate by the resolution of this evening, and the Government goes to the country; it does not go to the country in the technical sense, but it presents this issue: 'Are you prepared to have this measure rejected by the House of Lords?' I am not a member of the Government, but if I was, I should pray for nothing more earnestly than this, that noble lords would give the opportunity which you are anxious to give them by your vote this evening. You cannot even secure that appeal to the country. I know that the wish is father to the thought; and it has been thought that you could secure that appeal. I saw some not very obscure indications of that in the speech of the noble Earl (Carnarvon) who led off this afternoon; but you cannot obtain this appeal to the country.

"It is quite true that we gathered from the cheers of the noble Marquis that there is to be a second rejection of this Bill when it comes before the House again. It is possible that then you may secure this appeal to the country. But

are you quite sure of your army with regard to the second rejection? I am not at all sure, after the time that we are about to pass through before this Bill comes up again, that the army will not have melted away. Some will have listened to the dictates of reason; some will be satisfied with one rejection; some will have married wives and bought oxen, and done the other things of which we are told in Scripture. There will be a falling away, and if the Bill is thrown out a second time, it will be by a majority which will not at all strengthen the position of the noble Marquis. The noble Marquis knows himself—nobody better—what it was to lead a storming party to the breach, and find himself alone. There is a sinister sameness in the results of these attacks. I implore him now, before it is too late, to reflect on the character of the army he is to lead. If he relies on the second rejection of this Bill to give him the appeal which he covets—and, as I think, covets in the most mistaken and unfortunate manner—I do not feel quite sure that he is more right in his anticipations than he has been on previous occasions.

“My Lords, having considered what you cannot effect, allow me to put before you one or two things that you can effect by your vote. If your vote is uncertain in some respects, it is absolutely certain in other respects. There will be an agitation in this country of a violent and

terrible kind. I am not speaking in any sense in the language of menace; I am only predicting absolutely certain results from which I myself recoil. I cannot help noticing the signs we have had of an agitation of a most deplorable nature. It was only the other day that a friend of mine, a guide and instructor of the youth of this country, went to a public meeting and said that unfortunately only one member of this House was hanged in the last two centuries, but he did not know how many deserved to be hanged. He did not explain how this miscarriage of justice had taken place, but he hinted, not obscurely, that capital punishment ought to be the lot of most of us. I quite admit this was a *reductio ad absurdum*; I do not think that the House of Lords is weakened by language of that sort. But that is only prognostic of an agitation which would be odious and horrible in its character, but which will not be an attack on individuals, which would not stop at individuals, but would go to generalities, and would attack every member and the foundations of this House. There is one more result which is absolutely certain from an agitation of this kind. You will have, if we may gather from the experience of 1867, not a less but a more violent measure of reform forced upon you by the agitation which you are about to encourage. That is the experience of 1866 and 1867; and whether the more violent measure be passed, as

on a former occasion, by noble lords opposite, I venture to predict it would go further and be wider than the Bill before the House.

“But there is another consequence of which I implore your lordships to think. I do not think that trade, or commerce, or agriculture is in the state their warmest friends could wish. But there is no such certainty as this, that the great disturbance they must suffer from the agitation, of which you may see the beginning, but of which I deny that any noble lord opposite can see the limit, will be most injurious to them. Let me quote the weighty words of the citizens of London in the year 1831; they bear so much on the present occasion. They besought their ‘lordships to consider that the majorities by which the House of Commons has pronounced its own reform have been triumphant and overwhelming; that the rejection or the mutilation of a measure thus unanimously welcomed, and already half-assured, must spread universal disappointment and dismay; and as their daily support depends upon the undisturbed prosecution of their industry, they contemplate with unfeigned alarm the possibility of discontent and exasperation to such a degree as would paralyse commerce, deprive the labouring population of employment, and fatally endanger public credit. They therefore respectfully, but earnestly, implore their lordships to avert these perilous consequences.’ These

words are not less appropriate now than they were in 1831.

“I want to ask your lordships this practical question: Are you thinking most of the interests of your party, or most of the interests of this House? I put aside the question of country, because I give to noble lords opposite the fullest credit for doing the best they can in the interests of the country. I ask if you are doing the wisest thing, not with regard to your party—for I am afraid noble lords opposite would not take my advice on questions of party strategy—but whether you are doing the wisest thing with regard to this House? You are placing this House, this ancient institution, in a position for which it is most unsuited and most unfitted—I mean the risky and unsuitable position of trying to dam a torrent of popular feeling. You may have a thing which is valuable of itself, but you may put it to a very bad use. A connoisseur paid £4,500 the other day for an ancient, elaborate, costly horn. That would be a very bad instrument for poking the fire with. That is precisely what you are about to do on this occasion. You are using an institution of the most ancient and most valuable kind to poke up a conflagration for which it is wholly unsuited, and of which I, for one, cannot pretend to see the limits. Let me use another consideration with regard to this matter. This House would put itself in antagonism with

an army as large as that of Xerxes—two millions strong—two millions of persons desirous of this vote—and in the breach to resist these two millions there is an army about as large as that which defended Thermopylæ. But the army at Thermopylæ had singular advantages which this House has not. It had supports which I do not think noble lords opposite have, because they are fighting in a plain, without reinforcements or supports of any kind.

“You may say, as was said in reference to another military transaction, *C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre*. What is the feeling of this host of two millions of men whom you are trying to keep out? You cannot substantially retard the enfranchisement which they desire. They will have the vote in 1886, whether you pass the resolution or not. They consider it a birthright born of the general election and the decision of the House of Commons. I am afraid they will not understand your fine discrimination as to the votes being valueless without redistribution. I am afraid they will see the fatal flaw which underlay the whole of the honourable and learned Earl's ingenious speech. He said, ‘Oh, it is nothing to get a vote—it is the question of redistribution which is important.’ But the point is this, not what noble lords here think as to the value of the vote, but what the two millions who want the vote think about it, and whether

the millions who have the vote already think it absolutely valueless without an ingenious arrangement of redistribution.

“There are two classes of voters who will be admitted by this Bill. There are the agricultural classes, who have a fair right to look to the Conservative party as their friends—who have always looked upon the Conservative party as their friends, and who, I am afraid, will not understand the action of noble Lords opposite, who appear determined to retard their enjoyment of the franchise. Then there is the non-agricultural class. Each time those who belong to that class cross the legal line which parts the boroughs from the counties, they will reflect upon the fact that they might have enjoyed a vote if it had not been for the action of your lordships. So often as they meet voters who live within the magic line they will say: ‘There is no difference between us, but we are not voters, while they are; and this stigma is attached to us by the House of Lords.’ And I venture to ask your lordships whether it is with a blessing or with a curse that they will regard this House? These are considerations which cannot be disregarded by any House, however powerful or authoritative it may be.

“If the people of this country be with you, you are justified in the course you are now taking. If the House of Commons does not

represent the people of this country, you are justified in the course you are going to take to-night. If the three millions of voters who already possess the suffrage are anxious to preserve the artificial legal distinction between the town and the country, then, my lords, you are justified in the course you are going to take to-night. If the two million non-electors who are reckoning upon the promises and the votes of the House of Commons, and upon the practical unanimity with which the Bill has passed, feel that they are not entitled to the vote which you are going to deny them, and are prepared to kiss the rod with which you chastise them, you are justified in the course you are going to take to-night.

“ But, my lords, is it on such hopes and on such prognostications as this that you are about to face the storms of popular prejudice and popular indignation? The crisis is grave. We stand by a precipice if we are not hurrying to it, and I cannot console myself with any of those honeyed expressions about our authority and our standing in the country which afford so much consolation to the noble Earl. I see a situation as grave as the unwisdom of a leader and the strength of a party in this House are able to produce. I do think that when we consider what we have at stake to-night, we have a right to appeal to the more independent members of

this House. I do not pretend to say that we have at stake to-night the existence of this House, because I do not think so; but we have at stake that without which existence is not valuable or tolerable—the weight and the authority which is given by wise decisions and by sympathy with the nation, that nation for which we legislate and which governs us. I venture to appeal to the independent members of this House to pause before they vote for the amendment of the noble Earl. I was delighted with the defence of the cross benches which came from the noble Duke (Argyll) who has sat so long during his Parliamentary career on the front bench, and I am quite willing to endorse all that he said. But I appeal to these crowded cross benches, which are always asking to be enlarged—I appeal to them—to those who can regard politics without being influenced by mere temporary party prejudices—I appeal to them to pause before they endorse the action of the noble Earl.

“But, my lords, if I may make another appeal, it would be to those right reverend prelates who in this House represent a faith and who preach a gospel which is not merely a message of peace and goodwill to men, but which is also the highest and the purest theory of democracy which has yet been vouchsafed to men. I appeal to them to assist us in giving this great privilege to two millions of our countrymen, and I appeal



Photo. by J. Valentine.

DALMENY CASTLE.

to them to separate this House from the storms and anxieties that we must face if we pass this resolution. I do not say that I regard this motion as a wanton one—wanton is too strong a word. I have no right either from my standing or my age to use any such expression. But I have the right to ask your lordships to pause on every consideration, public, private, and personal, which can influence an ancient and illustrious Senate. I would ask you in the interests of your order, of your authority, and of your party, to pause before you pass a resolution which may strike a fatal blow at your existence.”

Lord Rosebery's eloquence, delivered in a House absolutely hostile to his views, was not likely to secure the passage of the measure; but it created stir and consternation, and efforts towards a compromise between the two parties. Nevertheless the Franchise Bill was rejected by three hundred and fifty-one votes to fifty-nine. The chief ground of objection alleged was that the Bill was not accompanied by a Redistribution of Seats Bill.

What happened afterwards was not, as had been expected, a dissolution of Parliament, but a campaign in Midlothian, Mr. Gladstone again being Lord Rosebery's guest, and an autumn session of Parliament. After a bitter controversy, a compromise was eventually arranged. There was a good deal of consultation amongst

418 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

party leaders, and a Redistribution Bill was agreed upon. On November 13 the Franchise Bill was passed by the House of Lords. This led to an interesting exchange of views between Mr. Gladstone and Lord Tennyson, who was then Poet Laureate. The day after the Bill was passed by the House of Lords, Lord Tennyson sent to Mr. Gladstone the following lines :

Steersman, be not precipitate in thine act
Of steering, for the river here, my friend,
Parts in two channels, moving to one end—
This goes straight forward to the cataract :
That streams about the bend.
But tho' the cataract seems the nearer way,
Whate'er the crowd on either bank may say,
Take thou "the bend," 'twill save thee many a day.

Mr. Gladstone replied :

" DOWNING STREET, *Nov.* 15, 1884.

" MY DEAR TENNYSON,—

" I think it a great honour to receive from you a suggestion in verse. For three months I have laboured to the best and utmost of my ability to avert a crisis and an era of organic change, which it seems to me that the Tory benches have been inviting ; and I have been quite willing to tread any path, direct or circuitous, which could lead me to the attainment of this end. Indeed, I have, as you advised, toiled in the circuitous method ; but unfortunately with this

issue, that, working round the labyrinth, I find myself at the end where I was at the beginning. However, in any and every way open to us we shall continue to work for peace. 'The resources of civilisation are not yet exhausted,' and I will not despair, provided our friends, and you among them, continue, as I feel sure it will be, to give us their firm and united support. Believe me,

"Yours most sincerely,

"W. E. GLADSTONE."

Between Lord Rosebery's address to the House of Lords in July and the passage of the Franchise Bill on November 13, there had been interesting doings at Dalmeny, which will be described in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XV

BRIGHT DAYS AT DALMENY—A ROYAL VISIT—TREE-PLANTING ON THE
LAWN BY PRINCES AND PRINCESSES—MR. GLADSTONE'S VISIT—
THE MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1884—NOTES BY "TOBY, M.P."
—THE G.O.M., THE AXE, AND THE OAK-TREES—LORD ROSEBERY
AT THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS—THE FREEDOM OF ABERDEEN—
A LETTER TO THE LORDS

ALL Scotland joined in the festivities which marked the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales and their children to Edinburgh in August, 1884, for the purpose of seeing the Forestry Exhibition and spending a few days with the Earl and Countess of Rosebery at Dalmeny. Their Royal Highnesses had visited Newcastle on August 21, where their reception was described by *The Scotsman* as one "which no European monarch could secure in any part of his dominions." The same journal added: "In Edinburgh the Prince and Princess of Wales have a city of friends; at Dalmeny they will have warm hospitality and a chance of a few days' quiet enjoyment of repose in the midst of scenery as lovely as any in the United Kingdom." On August 22 the Royal party reached Edinburgh, where the welcome given them was of the heartiest

character. The leading article in *The Scotsman* the next day thus concluded: "One other gratification the Prince and Princess must have experienced; it was to hear and see the demonstration of the popularity of Lord Rosebery, their host. Everywhere he was received with the warmest welcome. Hearty cheers told how strong is the hold he has on the affection of his countrymen, and how ready they are to recognise worthy service in their and the Imperial cause. In all this there will be a pleasure added to the visit to Edinburgh, and the strong promise of genuine rest and enjoyment at Dalmeny."

The Prince and Princess of Wales, with Princes Albert Victor and George and the Princesses, visited many places in Edinburgh. They spent much time at the Forestry Exhibition, and took a ride on the new electric railway, where it is recorded the princes amused themselves by ringing the electric bells during the trip. The Princess of Wales on that occasion received a unique gift—an electric bouquet presented to her by Miss Binks, and consisting of beautiful flowers with tiny electric incandescent lamps lighted and shining amongst them. The Infirmary and other institutions were inspected, and the Prince of Wales and his two sons, accompanied by the Earl of Rosebery, visited St. Giles's Cathedral.

On the way to Dalmeny the Royal guests passed through a succession of triumphal arches, and

were warmly cheered by the villagers at Dalmeny. Barnbogle Castle had hoisted above it a huge flag. At Dalmeny the Countess of Rosebery received the guests, and about nine o'clock the party sat down to dinner, the company including the Prince and Princess of Wales, Princes Albert Victor and George, Princesses Louise, Victoria, and Maud of Wales.

The district of Dalmeny is remarkable alike for its picturesque surroundings and for its historical interest. Within the extensive barony of Dalmeny and Barnbogle the grounds by successive undulations rise from the shore to a considerable elevation, and, tastefully ornamented as they are with large masses of thriving plantation, so arranged as to afford a rich variety of landscape, they command at the same time numberless views of the Forth and of the surrounding country which cannot easily be surpassed in respect of extent or beauty. The historical interest the neighbourhood possesses is perhaps sufficiently attested by its topography, embracing its Queensferry, its Port Edgar, its St. Margaret's Hope, and such-like. Not far from Dalmeny House, too, at Cramond Brig, is the scene of Jock Howieson's memorable meeting with his sovereign, James V., "the gudeman o' Ballengeich," which brought to the former the absolute ownership of the land he then tilled, on the condition of doing service to the Crown by presenting a basin of

water and a towel to the sovereign whenever called upon to do so.

The mansion of Dalmeny is quite a modern edifice, having been erected in the beginning of the present century by Archibald John Primrose, fourth Earl of Rosebery. Designed by William Wilkins, architect, it expresses a phase of the Perpendicular style as it obtained in England during the fifteenth century—its conspicuous features being its four-centred arch, its mullioned and transomed windows, its angular turrets at the corners, and its battlemented parapets. There are many fine works of art to be seen, among them good examples of Murillo and Vandyke.

A few hundred yards from Dalmeny House stands Barnbogle Castle, the ancient stronghold of the Mowbrays, which has recently been restored by the Earl of Rosebery. Built in 1414 on a peak of land known as the Hound Point (from a legend which sets forth that whenever a lord of Barnbogle approaches death the spectre of a man and a hound appears, the man blowing a long, piercing note on the bugle), the castle passed into the hands of the Primroses two centuries and a half later—in 1662. Shortly after the erection of Dalmeny House—towards the commencement of the present century—Barnbogle Castle fell into a dismantled condition, and in its reconstruction the present Earl is understood, according to *The Scotsman*, to have

had regard to the fact that the venerable pile was marked upon the charts used by vessels navigating the Firth of Forth, and that its removal would have created confusion to navigators. In this connection some signification may be assigned to the quotation introduced by the present Earl in a panel on the east side of the new structure: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy forefathers have set." The present edifice was reared upon the original foundations. It has a tower at the east corner eighty feet high. Externally the building expresses well the baronial features of our national style, with its corbels, crow-stepped gables, and turrets.

On the Saturday following their arrival at Dalmeny the Royal party inspected the Forth Bridge Works, and on the Sunday, after morning service, lunch was served at Barnbogle. On Monday the Royal guests left Dalmeny, and continued their journey northwards. Before taking their departure from Dalmeny Park the Royal family commemorated the visit by planting seven trees. This interesting ceremony took place on the lawn in front of the mansion, the trees, which consisted of plane and horse-chestnut trees, being planted in a group. The largest of the trees—a plane—was planted in the centre by Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales. The Prince of Wales planted the next, and the other members of the family in turn performed the same

ceremony. Their Royal Highnesses were accompanied on the lawn by the Earl and Countess of Rosebery. Mr. Allan, the forester on the estate, and Mr. Campbell, the clerk of works, were in attendance, and during the ceremony the Prince took occasion to speak to Mr. Campbell, whom he recognised as having seen on a former visit to Dalmeny many years previously. The whole party, as they stood on the lawn, were photographed by Mr. Moffat, Edinburgh. Shortly afterwards the Royal guests departed, the Earl and Countess of Rosebery driving with them in the same carriage to the station, drawn by four horses.

Two days after the departure of the Royal visitors Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone arrived at Dalmeny. The journey was undertaken for what may be called the third Midlothian campaign, and in many of its features it was a repetition of the triumphal progress of the autumn of 1879. Many things had happened since then, but nothing had changed the feeling of personal devotion which Liberals had for their great leader. Wherever Mr. Gladstone went there were great and enthusiastic meetings. There were demonstrations at the railway stations as he passed northwards. Deputations waited for him on the railway platforms, and many addresses of welcome were presented to him. Brief speeches were delivered at nearly a dozen towns on the journey. At Edinburgh a great crowd awaited his arrival. He

was received at the station by Lord Rosebery, who was accompanied by Lord Carington, Mr. Cowan, and the Lord Provost. Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone on that occasion looked the picture of health. Taking Lord Rosebery's arm, Mr. Gladstone made his way to the carriage. Mrs. Gladstone and Miss Gladstone had some difficulty in following them, for the station scene was one of wild excitement. All the way to Dalmeny the streets were lined with cheering people. On their arrival the distinguished guests were received by the Countess of Rosebery.

With the exception of a surprise visit to the Forth Bridge Works, Mr. Gladstone spent the next day at Dalmeny. Friday also was spent quietly. The Forestry Exhibition and the Liberal Club were visited by the Premier and Lord Rosebery. On August 30 he made the first great speech of the campaign at a meeting at the Edinburgh Corn Exchange. The Franchise Bill and the Lords was the subject, and "No surrender!" was the spirit in which the Premier dealt with it. He also spoke of the Bill for a Secretary for Scotland, and must have been convinced that the people of Scotland ardently desired it.

"An incident of the proceedings," commented *The Scotsman*, "which it is impossible not to notice, was the unmistakable evidences of the cordial and growing feeling with which Lord Rosebery is

regarded by the Liberal party. Few politicians receive such flattering marks of confidence as Lord Rosebery received on Saturday in the assemblage both outside and inside the Corn Exchange. He found it impossible to resist the calls made for him in the meeting, and when he rose he had the whole vast audience standing before him and cheering vociferously. It was a reception which any statesman might envy."

Lord Rosebery did his best to keep silence; but the meeting in the Corn Exchange, like the meetings held subsequently, insisted upon remarks from him. The people shouted for him until he was compelled to rise and speak in response. He devoted his remarks on this occasion to a brief appreciation of Mr. Gladstone and a few words about the Lords. "There is a contest between the great men of the nation which inhabits these islands and the majority of fifty-nine peers, which I cannot now analyse, but which I warned them, before that division was taken, was no weapon to use in a contest with the people of this country."

The Sunday was spent at Dalmeny, a walk being taken in the afternoon to Barnboug Castle. On the Monday, September 1, Mr. Gladstone delivered another great speech in the Corn Exchange, defending the policy of the Government along the whole line of its proceedings both at home and abroad. Mr. Gladstone on this occasion

spoke for only ten minutes short of two hours. Once more the audience insisted upon a speech from Lord Rosebery, who remarked that the meeting was an emphatic answer to those who had said and written that the Prime Minister, in the face of two volumes of his speeches in Midlothian, did not wish to meet his constituents again. "I suppose that every voter among you," he added, "and that every one among you who ought to be a voter, would be proud to see Mr. Gladstone under your roof; and I can assure him that there is the roof of one who is not a voter, and never has been a voter, and is never likely to be a voter, which is always ready for him if he should care to add a third volume to the Midlothian speeches."

The short, brief, and brilliant visit of the Premier was brought to a conclusion by a demonstration on the following day promoted by the working men of Edinburgh and Leith, which took place in the Waverley Market. Lord Rosebery, after the Prime Minister had spoken, was called upon for an address. He summed up the Midlothian visit by saying, "We know that the task of the Prime Minister has been not to stimulate but to stay, not to excite but to soothe the ardour and passion of a justly indignant people." There were in the House of Lords, he reminded the gathering, many who were prepared to march with the people. "If any

fresh evidence were needed," said *The Scotsman* in its leading article the next day, "of the place which Lord Rosebery has gained in the hearts of his fellow-countrymen, it is supplied in the magnificent reception accorded to him yesterday. The confidence of Scotsmen is not readily won, but it is given to Lord Rosebery in unstinted measure. . . . While the Upper House can boast of many such earnest and active Liberals as Lord Rosebery and Lord Reay there still remains the probability that it will escape the penalty of the folly into which it has been led by the Opposition chiefs."

On Wednesday, September 4, the visit of Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone ended, and they left Dalmeny for Deeside. It was at this time that so much was heard of the tree-cutting recreation of Mr. Gladstone. In connection with this visit to Dalmeny, "Toby, M.P.," wrote in *Punch* the "Essence of Midlothian," which nearly every newspaper quoted and which every one read. Some extracts from the diary run :

August 27.—Edinburgh at last. What a crowd! Evidently want a speech. Shall I? No, let me dissemble. There's Rosebery, mine host. And there's the Countess! This is too kind. Whenever I go to strange house or strange town, I want no better welcome than a look from Lady Rosebery's kindly face.

"*August 28.*—Got out axe. Always carry axe

430 Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches

about with me on these little journeys from home.

If any one axes for why,
I hit him a rap with my crook.
'It's Salisbury kills me,' say I.

"Put it that way only for metrical exigencies. Mean to kill Salisbury to-morrow night.

"Steal softly downstairs with axe on my shoulder. Household asleep. Stroll into park—find nice promising young oak—just the thing to take before breakfast. Rosebery turns up—seems a little annoyed—asks if I do not think I'll tire myself. 'Oh, no,' I say: 'used to it; generally take a tree, or half a tree, according to size, when I get up in the morning.' Rosebery says he'll show me where there are some nice trees. Evidently hit upon a wrong one.

"*Saturday*.—Drove into Edinburgh. Immense crowds. Of course can't go in for abolishing Peers with Granville and Kimberley and Spencer, and rest in Cabinet. Rosebery says he would gladly exchange his coronet for a seat in the House of Commons for Manchester, or Liverpool, or some big town. But Rosebery's young and enthusiastic. If Dizzy had still been in the Lords, can't say what might have happened. Certainly it would have been fun to abolish him.

". . . Quite fresh after speech. Wanted to walk back to Dalmeny, but that Rosebery said would be late for dinner.

"*Sabbath*.—Went to kirk in Edinburgh. Rosebery says proper thing to do is to go to morning service—take oatmeal cake and slice of strongly flavoured cheese to munch in interval succeeding on morning service, and so be in good time for the afternoon. We did this, and spent very pleasant day. Morning sermon one hour and twenty minutes; afternoon discourse a little shorter—only seventy minutes. Noticed pervading smell of peppermint. Old lady in pew behind presses lozenges on my acceptance, which I surreptitiously place in the inner band of Rosebery's hat. Interesting to watch Rosebery, when we leave, putting on his hat, taking it off, looking inside, finding nothing, and putting it on with troubled brow. 'Anything wrong?' I ask. 'No,' he says; 'only fancied I'd got wrong hat.' Strange how these little incidents cheer me in midst of serious business of life.

"*Monday*.—Not sure I shan't take a hand in the games myself. Practising 'putting the stone' this morning. After third throw I put it in the vinery, where I'm afraid it did a little damage, though Rosebery says not. Rather makes out that he likes his guests to heave half a brick into his glass houses and spoil his grapes. Wouldn't think visit had gone off well without it. But that is his politeness."

Mr. H. W. Lucy knew well the kindly disposition of the Earl of Rosebery, who some years

later did him the honour to preside at a lecture which "Toby, M.P.," delivered on "The Parliaments of the Queen."

Soon after the departure of Mr. Gladstone from Dalmeny, Lord Rosebery proceeded to Aberdeen, where he delivered two speeches on September 11. The first was a special address to the Trades Union Congress, which was holding its seventeenth annual gathering in that city. Lord Rosebery attended in response to a second invitation to address the Congress. He had been invited to do so four years before, a request to which, however, he was not able on that occasion to accede.

The following is an extract from the report of his speech, which dealt largely with Imperial Federation. He said he thought it would be very useful if legislators attended more often these trade congresses. He had been asked to come and speak, whereas what he ought to do was to come to listen and learn. He would indulge in no empty expressions of sympathy with the working classes; these were quite unnecessary. Deeds and not words were what working men required at the hands of those wishing to serve them. The work of the Congress was, generally speaking, of a kind profoundly interesting to every patriot and politician. The delegates thrashed out subjects which must eventually come before Parliament, and they did so in such a practical manner, apart from political partizanship, as enabled those

subjects to come before the Legislature in a more matured and fully prepared form. . . . He was also much struck with what he called the federalism of their Trades Union Congress, which embraced local or detached self-management for the different unions with a common bond and centre of united influence in their Congress. It would surely be well if this principle of federalism was far more widely applied to the Colonial concerns of the British Empire. . . . His main view in coming there that day was to call the attention of the Congress to this matter, because it was a vital matter not merely to the Empire, but also to the working classes, whom the delegates present so largely represented. . . . It might seem paradoxical, but it was absolutely true, that this question was more important even than the franchise question which was now agitating the country. . . . Nothing could be done in this matter without the impulse that came from the popular will ; and the subject must become one of principle and creed with the working classes before it became one of practical politics. In conclusion, he ventured to affirm that the bond which united the various component parts of this Empire must either become stronger or weaker, and could not continue to exist in its present somewhat indefinite form. He maintained that it was most desirable that the bond should become stronger, and that the working classes who mainly peopled our Colonial Empire

should place this important subject in their programme for early and serious consideration.

Later in the day Lord Rosebery was presented with the freedom of Aberdeen. In responding, he dwelt upon the growth of great cities in the present day, and the results which followed from this. He noted, as one of the results that were advantageous, that it tended to produce a race of administrators fit for Imperial as well as municipal concerns, instancing Mr. Chamberlain by way of illustration of this. It would lead to an extension of local Government in the future, which was especially desirable in the case of Scotland.

Subsequently to the visit to Aberdeen, Lord Rosebery stayed for a brief period at his Postwick property, near Norwich. Then he went north again, Mr. Gladstone being expected at Dalmeny on September 23. On the afternoon of that day, while Lord Rosebery was riding to Dalmeny, his horse put a foot in a rabbit-hole and fell, with the result that his lordship was thrown, and sustained a somewhat severe injury in the shape of a broken collar-bone. The accident was especially inopportune, and caused much disappointment to the Earl, who was unable, in consequence, to devote that personal attention to Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone that he always loved to give. Lord Rosebery was confined to his room for several days, and indeed, at one point in his indisposition,

some little anxiety was felt as to his condition. The Queen and the Prince and Princess of Wales were among those who inquired as to the health of the invalid. He progressed favourably after the first day or two, but rest and quiet were imperatively necessary. The patient at that time suffered serious inconvenience in consequence of sleeplessness—a misfortune which has since caused him far greater trouble.

Some weeks afterwards Lord Rosebery had sufficiently recovered to return to town, and he appeared several times in the House of Lords with his left arm in a sling. On December 3, 1884, he was the principal guest at a dinner of the Liverpool Reform Club. Responding to the toast of his health, after some preliminary references to his recent voyage round the world—"I can conscientiously say that no six months of my life have given me equal instruction or profit"—he dealt with the Navy, and the necessity that it should be strong, and expressed himself as against the evacuation of Egypt at that time. He remarked: "We have duties to fulfil in Egypt. One is positive, and one is negative. One we owe to the Egyptians, and one we owe to ourselves. The first duty is to establish a stable state of things in Egypt, so that when we leave Egypt we may leave behind us a Government that can stand alone—an independent Power, respectable and respected—a Government which should

✓

not leave room for foreign intrigue or for foreign action. The second duty, that we owe to ourselves, and that we have to fulfil, is to take care that, so far as in us lies, no foreign nation shall take our place. Whether there be two schools or not in the Liberal party on this question, there is only one opinion on this point—that no strong foreign nation should be permitted to occupy the great highway between our Indian and Colonial empires and ourselves.” He dwelt with satisfaction on the recent agreement arrived at between the Liberal and Conservative parties on the question of the franchise and redistribution, to which reference is made in a previous chapter. He pointed out that the idea of ending the House of Lords involved revolution, and indicated his own preference for a reform of the House of Lords from within itself. In furtherance of this view he, in December, 1884, addressed the following letter (it was published on December 24) to a large number of peers :

“LANSDOWNE HOUSE, BERKELEY SQUARE.

“*December, 1884.*

“MY LORD,—I venture to ask you, if you are favourable to the general principle of the reform of the House of Lords (without pledging yourself to any particular method or to any views of mine), to be so good as to communicate with me, so that concerted action may be taken in the

matter. Perhaps, too, you may be able to communicate the names of other Peers who are favourable to the idea.

"I am, etc.,

"ROSEBERY."

The Lords, speaking generally, gave no sign in response that they were at all desirous of altering the constitution of their House.

On January 29, 1885, Lord Rosebery opened a Sailors' Home at Leith. His address concluded with the following striking peroration :

"You call it the Sailors' Home—you call it justly the Sailors' Home ; but the sailors' home is a much larger thing than any building in Leith—or Leith itself. The sailors' home is this island of Great Britain, in which we stand at this moment ; and so long as it is the sailors' home, I am quite certain that we need not fear for the future of our country, and that all the care, and all the honour, and all the attention that you can pay to these sailors of whom these glorious islands are the home will be gratefully accepted and richly repaid."

CHAPTER XVI

THE SOUDAN EXPEDITION—GORDON'S MISSION—CAPTURE OF KHARTOUM
AND MASSACRE OF THE GARRISON—LORD ROSEBERRY AND MR.
GLADSTONE—THE SPEECH AT EPSOM—LORD PRIVY SEAL AND
FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS—LORD ROSEBERRY A CABINET
MINISTER—FIRMNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY—THE THREATENED WAR
WITH RUSSIA—PEACE SECURED—DEFEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT—
SCOTTISH LIBERALS AND THE EARL

FOR the Gladstone Government, the sands of office were rapidly running out in the early months of 1885. Enthusiastic crowds at meetings and at railway stations were a tribute to the marvellous personal influence which Mr. Gladstone exercised over the people for so many years; but they did not cheek the misfortunes nor increase the popularity of a Government which had to face the fall of Khartoum and the death of General Gordon. Events in Egypt had been followed by the public with intense interest, and the fall of Khartoum—or rather the fact that Gordon was not saved—was felt to be a national disgrace, the responsibility for which was attached to the Gladstone Government. Arabi Pasha had in 1882 issued a manifesto, "Egypt for the Egyptians," and ended the dual control of Egyptian

finance. Gambetta's ministry in France had fallen at the end of January, and his successor De Freycinet was indisposed for Egyptian enterprise. A combined French and English fleet was, however, despatched to Alexandria, where a great massacre occurred in the middle of June. There Arabi, having restored order, entrenched himself, and disregarded the joint orders and threats of the English and French admirals. On July 11 the French fleet steamed away. The British admiral, Sir Beauchamp Seymour, forthwith destroyed the forts, the feature of the action being the plucky conduct of Lord Charles Beresford and the famous signal: "Well done, *Condor*!" A few weeks afterwards British troops were in Egypt, and Arabi was defeated at Tel-el-Kebir.

Mr. Gladstone had objected to Lord Beaconsfield's Egyptian policy, but by this time his views of the position were as thus set out:

"France, in the exercise of her undoubted right to judge of her duties, withdrew, and left us to confront the sole execution of the engagements contracted. We set up the new Khedive, and by setting him up we became morally bound to support him; and not only so, but we entered into an actual covenant with the French to support him. The consequence was, having in our hands the effectual control of the Government, and having on the throne a Sovereign whom we had put there, and who had not violated any of his

duties, we were bound to sustain him. That is the history of the embarrassments into which we were brought in that country."

In that view he was not supported by some of his colleagues, and was met by the resignation of Mr. Bright and the withdrawal of the support of other old friends who disagreed with him. Nevertheless, after Alexandria and Tel-el-Kebir, the justification of British policy seemed to be made out by its success, in spite of the intrigues of opposing diplomatists, disease, and the Mahdi. In 1884 General Gordon's mission was despatched. Speaking in the House of Commons on February 23, 1885, Mr. Gladstone said :

"General Gordon went not for the purpose of reconquering the Soudan or of persuading the chiefs of the Soudan again to submit themselves to the Egyptian Government. He went for the double purpose of evacuating the country by the extrication of the Egyptian garrisons, and reconstituting it by giving back to those chiefs their ancestral powers, which had been withdrawn or suspended during the period of the Egyptian Government."

Mr. F. W. Hirst says: "Instead of carrying out his instructions he attempted to re-establish an Egyptian Empire." How it was possible to carry out the mission described in the passage from Mr. Gladstone's speech just quoted without re-establishing the Egyptian Empire in the Soudan

it is difficult to conceive. The Mahdi was not exactly the sort of man to permit quietly "the reconstitution of the country by giving back to those chiefs their ancestral powers which had been withdrawn"; and the Gordon mission interpreted by a general in such a position as Gordon must have meant the smashing of the Mahdi or nothing. But the Mahdi's time had not yet come. Gordon found himself shut up in Khartoum, and gallantly withstood a prolonged siege. Owing to treachery the city fell, and the garrison were massacred. Just previously Gordon had sent to the gallant force which Lord Wolseley was leading to his rescue a hopeful message, indicating that there need be no immediate anxiety for the safety of the city. The relieving force had made one of the most brilliant and rapid marches in the annals of the British Army. But, by treachery within Khartoum, they arrived just too late, and when the steamers with the relief troops came within sight of the city, it was to see only ruins where the garrison had been, and there was nothing to do but return.

Early in the year 1885 the news of Gordon's death came home, and public feeling was greatly embittered. It was felt that the expedition to relieve Gordon should have been despatched sooner instead of being deferred until, apparently, only the pressure of public opinion, and not the anxiety of the Government, forced the step. In

Parliament the Government only escaped from votes of censure by very narrow majorities; and even the firmness of Mr. Gladstone regarding the Penj-deh incident (when, in view of the differences between this country and Russia as to the Afghan border, the House of Commons unanimously gave Mr. Gladstone a vote of credit for £11,000,000) did little to blot out the memory of the Khartoum disaster. It was the hour of need with Mr. Gladstone, and it was in that hour the Earl of Rosebery came and stood by his chief, when attacks were being made upon him from all quarters. The story of Lord Rosebery's resignation of his Under-Secretaryship at the Home Office has been told. If things had gone well with the Gladstone Government subsequently, he certainly would not have taken office again during that Parliament. But, when disaster seemed imminent, he went to Mr. Gladstone's aid, although his views of Egyptian policy differed considerably from those of his leader. Lord Rosebery would, had he been in office, have favoured a much stronger and more vigorous policy. On February 9 Lord Rosebery spoke at the Epsom Liberal Club of the situation which had been created. That Gordon was dead was then feared, but not positively known. He moved the following resolution:

"That this meeting, while fully sharing the national anxiety as to the situation in the Soudan

and the fate of General Gordon, urges on the Government the necessity of perseverance in the cause of domestic reform, and the desirability of drawing closer the ties which unite Great Britain with her Colonies. That this meeting congratulates Her Majesty's Government on the passing of the Franchise Bill and the practical settlement of the redistribution question, and desires to record its unabated confidence in the present Administration." He remarked: "There is one topic which is now filling our minds to the exclusion of all others—a topic which has seized hold of the national mind to the exclusion of all others. I need not say what that subject is. You cannot walk through the humblest or obscurest village without some labourer coming and asking if there is any news of *him*. There is no need to mention the name. All know who 'him' is. I cannot help feeling as if the sorrow which has befallen Great Britain has come to test the spirit and patriotism of the country. The greatness of a nation, like the greatness of an individual, is shown not in the moment of prosperity but in moments of adversity. . . . But even if Gordon is dead, we should not mourn. We know that he has died the death he would have chosen—a soldier's death upon the field of duty, To every man on earth death comes sooner or later, and how can a man die better than for 'the ashes of his fathers and the temple of his gods'? Continuing,

Lord Rosebery said he had been rather shocked to see that one of the first thoughts in many minds appeared to be that the fall of Khartoum involved the fall of the Government. In this hideous crisis it never occurred to him to think of who might be occupying places or who might be wishing to occupy places. He did not pretend to have concurred with the policy of the Government in Egypt. On more than one occasion he had exercised the right of a private judgment, and had ventured to say that a bolder and clearer course might have been adopted. But he knew that the Government had had to deal with a situation of unexampled difficulty, and, so far from thinking that it would be important to turn the Government out, it was a time in which he trusted every Englishman wished to strengthen the Government in every way. . . . It seemed to him the democracy would comport itself in the hour of danger with dignity and with valour, and would carry the flag of Great Britain, which was entrusted to its care, as efficiently as the generations which had preceded it. This disaster was full of lessons. He hoped it would, if even only for a moment, unite the nation. He should be glad if it raised the nation, if only for a moment, out of the atmosphere of party, in which by various circumstances we were compelled to live. After all, what was really peaceful was firmness. There was nothing so warlike as

indecision. There was nothing so likely to bring about war as anxiety at all events to avoid war. He urged the importance of Colonial federation. He trusted that good might come out of evil. We did not desire to encroach or meddle, but to unite and maintain our just authority, to keep from the impeachment of waste our unselfish interests for good, and to preserve and unite together those nationalities which were to us a pledge and heritage of our Empire.

Lord Rosebery, however, was not content only to speak. He had resigned office when the Government was strong. He resumed office when it was tottering to its fall. The day after the Epsom speech definite news came of Gordon's death. On the day following it was known that Lord Rosebery had accepted office as Lord Privy Seal and First Commissioner of Works, with a seat in the Cabinet. The appointment was approved by the press throughout the country. *The Daily News* remarked : " Lord Rosebery brings into it (the Cabinet) a new and fresh force of intellect and character, a keen perception of the facts and forces of political life, and an independence of judgment which is essentially needed in public men. Routine and formula have not mastered him. Lord Rosebery's personal devotion to Mr. Gladstone has been proved ; his enthusiastic affection for him is well known. But Lord Rosebery has not been overpowered by that

ascendancy of character and intellect which sometimes seems to absorb inferior men into the mind and purpose of the chief. He has shown himself to be vertebrate and not molluscous, and without that ostentatious or unseemly parade of difference which marks the too consciously inferior person, has known how to guard his own freedom of opinion and give forcible expression to his views. His entrance into the Cabinet is in itself a contribution to the more cordial union of the Empire. It will be welcomed throughout the Colonies. It is also, we hope, a sign that a somewhat quicker apprehension of our relations with foreign powers, and greater promptitude both of speech and action, will mark the conduct of the Government. His acceptance of ministerial responsibility is an event of political significance as regards the present, and is full of hope for the future."

That view reflected the opinion of the bulk of the nation. "Vertebrate and not molluscous." It was felt that a much-needed backbone had at last been given to the foreign policy of the Government, and the satisfaction with which the appointment was received showed the confidence of the nation at that time in the ability of Lord Rosebery to deal with foreign affairs in a manner satisfactory and safe.

On April 1, 1885, Lord Rosebery was the principal speaker at the annual meeting of the National Reform Union, at the Free Trade

Hall, Manchester. He objected to the terse and alliterative language of those who described the Government policy in the Soudan as one of "butcher and bolt," which he maintained was rather "a reasonable effort to leave the Soudan better than they found it." He maintained that the ground on which the Opposition claimed the confidence of the country was their aversion to Mr. Gladstone, but that the Empire could not be ruled on that principle, especially as the vast majority of the people of the country did not share that aversion.

It was the Cabinet which now included the Earl of Rosebery that decided to adopt the firm attitude towards Russia in regard to the Afghan frontier which led to the famous vote of credit for £11,000,000. Lord Rosebery's presence strengthened others in the Cabinet who considered that the maintenance of a firm policy in foreign affairs was essential to the interests of the country. Firmness in this instance undoubtedly secured peace, when a timid and uncertain policy would have almost assuredly resulted in war. For weeks it appeared that war was inevitable, and the columns of the daily newspapers were crowded with "war preparations." In India the Viceroy had presented the Ameer with a sword of honour, which the Ameer said he should be ready to draw against the Queen's enemies. Fighting took place between Russians and Afghans. Both Russia and England actively

pushed forward preparations for hostilities. In the midst of the crisis a considerable flutter was caused in Berlin by the announcement that Lord Rosebery was on his way to the German capital. Several journals had jumped to the conclusion that his lordship's mission must have some connection with the pending dispute between England and Russia ; but the more general belief was that his errand must be regarded as the complement of a visit paid by Count Herbert Bismarck to London a short while before. As Lord Rosebery and Count Herbert Bismarck were intimate friends, the social side of the visit was undoubtedly of interest, but a Cabinet Minister was not likely at such a time to devote all his conversation to private matters. Shortly after Lord Rosebery's return a Cabinet Council was held, and on April 21 Mr. Gladstone asked for and at once obtained the vote of credit of £11,000,000, partly for the Soudan expedition and partly for "special preparations." The speeches of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville left but faint hopes of a peaceful settlement of the Afghan controversy. A few days afterwards the Duke of Connaught, who was then on his return journey from India, was recalled to Simla. The situation was critical. The Russian troops were mobilised ; every one expected an immediate declaration of war. Then suddenly the situation changed. The tone of the Russian Government was modified ; a conciliatory despatch was received on May 2,

and in a few days it was known that the crisis was over, war had been averted, and a satisfactory arrangement was shortly afterwards announced. It was a great victory for the firm diplomacy in foreign affairs of which the latest addition to the Cabinet had been a consistent advocate.

In Parliament, however, the activity of Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and Lord George Hamilton greatly embarrassed the Government. Votes of censure were frequently moved, and defeated by only small majorities. The defeat of the Government came early in the morning of June 9. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had moved a second reading of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill. To this Sir Michael Hicks-Beach proposed the following amendment: "That this House regards the increase proposed by this Bill in the duties levied on beer and spirits as inequitable in the absence of a corresponding addition to the duties on wine, and declines to impose fresh taxation on real property until effect has been given to its resolution of April 17, 1883, and of March 28, 1884, by which it has acknowledged further measures of relief to be due to ratepayers in counties and boroughs in respect of local charges imposed on them for national services."

Mr. Gladstone, in defending the financial policy of the Government, described the issue as one of life or death to the Ministry. The Government

treated the amendment as one of confidence. The amendment was, shortly before one o'clock in the morning, carried by two hundred and sixty-four votes to two hundred and fifty-two. The Parnellites voted with the Opposition. The announcement of the figures was received with loud cheers by the Conservatives, and, central figure in a scene of great excitement, Lord Randolph Churchill stood on a bench and, waving his hat, shouted "Buckshot" and "Coercion." There were absent from the division sixty-one Liberal members unpaired.

The Cabinet met later in the day, and Mr. Gladstone, when the House met, announced the resignation of the Ministry. Lord Salisbury was sent for by the Queen, and decided to accept office. It was, however, certain that a general election must soon take place, and both parties actively prepared for the contest. During his brief tenure of office Lord Rosebery had become a man of first importance in the Cabinet, and it was certain that if the Liberals should return to power after the general election he would be called upon to take a high place in the Government. He was to be actively engaged during the rest of the year, and the most interesting gathering of this period was the banquet given by the Scottish Liberals to him during the Midlothian campaign, when the fact that he had won his spurs as a statesman was fully recognised.

The Scottish Liberals gave their great banquet in honour of the Earl of Rosebery, on November 13, 1885, in recognition of his distinguished services to Scotland and to the Liberal party. The arrangements were made by the Scottish Liberal Club, with Mr. Holmes Ivory as honorary secretary. It was recorded at the time that "the club had for several years been anxious to record their sense of Lord Rosebery's very remarkable services, but he had always resisted their proposals. The project, however, suffered nothing by the delay; on the contrary, the services which in the interval Lord Rosebery had done to the party, both in Scotland and in England, deepened the admiration and gratitude which Scottish Liberals felt towards him."

In every way the gathering was thoroughly representative of Scottish Liberalism, prominent men from every district being present. There had been no such gathering for half a century, and the Reform Banquet to Earl Grey in 1835 is the only one cited as equal to it. The celebration was held in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, the decorations of which included ornamental shields showing the Rosebery arms and motto, "Fide et Fiducia." Other inscriptions round the hall included, "I speak, I have spoken, for Unity and for the Empire," "Closer Union with the Colonies," "Reform of the House of Lords," "Scottish Administration—the Welfare of the

Scottish People," and "Scottish History and Literature." Beautiful flowers and foliage abounded on the tables, laurel leaves were to be seen everywhere. Seven hundred persons sat down to dinner, and amongst them, to the delight and the surprise of the great gathering, was Mr. Gladstone, to do honour to his distinguished young friend and colleague. The pleasure at seeing Mr. Gladstone was enhanced by the fact that his presence was the best assurance that a slight indisposition from which he had been suffering had passed away.

The Earl of Stair was in the Chair, having the guest of the evening on his immediate right and Mr. Gladstone next him on the left. Others present included the Earl of Aberdeen, the Marquis of Huntly, Lord Provost Clark, Mr. G. J. Goschen, M.P., Mr. Asher, Q.C., M.P., Mr. (now Sir) H. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., Sir George Campbell, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. Campbell, of Tilliechewan, Mr. E. Blake (formerly of Canada, and now an Irish M.P.), Mr. E. Marjoribanks, M.P., Sir R. Jardine, M.P., and Mr. R. W. Duff, M.P. When the banquet was over a large number of ladies came in to hear the speeches. They included the Countess of Rosebery and Mrs. Gladstone, who, of course, came over from Dalmeny, and the Countess of Aberdeen. Lady Rosebery was, on her entrance, presented with a beautiful bouquet on behalf of the Scottish Liberal Club.

In the course of a speech proposing "The Navy, Army, and Reserve Forces," the Earl of Aberdeen made an interesting prophecy regarding the future of their guest. He said :

"This gathering represents, in a manner which I suppose has rarely been equalled, the whole Liberals of Scotland ; and not only that, but it is regarded with the liveliest satisfaction and interest not only by those many Liberals of Scotland who are unable to be here to-night, but also by the Liberals of the remainder of Great Britain. And if anything was required to add to the completeness of this most memorable occasion, I think it is to be found in the fact that, owing to a happy and, I believe, unforeseen circumstance, this gathering is graced by the presence of our illustrious chief and leader (Mr. Gladstone), who thus joins with us in doing honour to the man who is not only a trusted friend and colleague of his, but a man who is marked out not only by his own striking qualities, but by the perceptive instincts of this country, 'as a future leader of the Liberal party.'"

This peep into the future was received with approving cheers by the great company present.

Mr. Holmes Ivory then read the address, which was presented to the Earl by the chairman. It ran as follows :

"To the Right Honourable Archibald Primrose, Earl of Rosebery. My Lord,—We, the members

of the Scottish Liberal Club, and Delegates of Liberal Associations throughout Scotland, attending the banquet given to your Lordship on this occasion, beg to express our deep sense of the valuable services which you have for many years past rendered to the cause of Liberal progress. The interest taken by your Lordship in all questions affecting the welfare of the Scottish people, and your intimate acquaintance with the history and literature of the country, have long been regarded with admiration by all sections of the community. In particular, the important subject of Scottish administration will always be associated with your name, and it is mainly to your efforts that the people of Scotland are indebted for the recent Act for the creation of a Scottish Department, presided over by a Secretary of State. This measure we regard as a great boon to the country, and the fact that the Department has charge of Scottish Education will, we trust, secure the preservation of those national characteristics in our educational system of which Scotsmen have always been justly proud. It is not in Scotland alone that you have rendered important services to the State. The consideration of the means by which the Colonies are to be brought into closer relations with the mother country, the grave subject of the reform of the House of Lords, and many other Imperial questions, have been elucidated and advanced by your exertions.

Your countrymen of all classes regarded with sincere satisfaction your entry as a Cabinet Minister into Mr. Gladstone's Government. In Opposition, the eloquent speeches which you have recently delivered in England and Scotland have been of inestimable value to the party, and have materially assisted in making plain to the country the nature of the issue which is to be decided at the approaching general election. We recognise from your latest utterances, as always, you speak of unity and for the Empire. We trust you may be long spared to render important service to the State.

"Signed on behalf of the Scottish Liberal Club, and by Delegates of Liberal Associations from all parts of Scotland."

Lord Stair, having presented the address, said :

"It is now my duty to propose to you the toast of the evening, 'The Health of Lord Rosebery,' our guest. This large, influential, and enthusiastic meeting, representing, I may say, Liberals 'frae Maiden Kirk to John o' Groat's,' speaks for itself, and proves, were proof wanting, the high place that our noble guest holds in the estimation of a large portion of his countrymen. We are met here to do him honour to-night, not altogether for those great talents which he possesses, and which we all so much admire—because many men have talents which they abuse; but it is because he has at all times been both ready and willing to use those talents for the benefit of his countrymen.

Never has he done this more conspicuously or more successfully than in his exertion for the Liberal cause in his native land. Ladies and gentlemen, it was a feeling of deep gratitude that has induced us to-night, in this very inadequate manner, to show him how highly we appreciate his services to the Liberal cause. We cannot forget that it was our noble guest who rescued this county from the Tory dominion under which it had been so long subjected. I have known this county long. I remember when the spirit of Liberalism used not to flourish—when, to use a good Scottish phrase, ‘it was sair hadden doon’—and eventually it became completely smothered in fagots. Well, gentlemen, our noble guest came to the rescue. He produced a champion from Dalmeny shade, who by his high character and great eminence secured a victory for us not in this county only, but secured a great Liberal triumph over the length and breadth of the land. So much for this county; but Lord Rosebery has done yeoman service elsewhere. We have only to look back to the last few weeks, and we find that he has not spared himself. He has attended and addressed meetings not only in Scotland, but also in England and Wales, where he advocated that union which is so necessary for the smooth working of the Liberal machine. Ladies and gentlemen, on this subject of unity I see painted on the wall, ‘Closer Union with the Colonies.’

I see opposite me, 'I have spoken for Unity and for the Empire.' Always unity. The next, 'Reform of the House of Lords,' I think I had better say nothing about. At these meetings Lord Rosebery advocated a sound Liberal policy, and at the same time exposed those fallacies by which the Tory party expect to gain a great majority at the next election. Well, politics apart, we all remember the able manner in which Lord Rosebery discharged the duties of Secretary for Scotland when he held that important office, the duties of which required both temper and tact. You all remember how accessible he was, how closely he investigated all the different questions that came before him, proving that he is 'not only well conversant with all Scottish affairs, but that he is a good man of business. I could go on in this way a good deal further, pointing out the services Lord Rosebery has done to the country. I will say nothing more than a word or two on the question of the Colonies. No man knows more of the requirements of the colonies than he does, and it redounds greatly to his credit that he has personally visited some of those colonies furthest from our shores. And I feel sure that the information he then acquired will be useful to him at no distant date when he is once more a prominent member of a Liberal Government. Our noble guest has a great career of usefulness before him, and in drinking his health I will ask you to

join me in wishing that he may long hold that high position of usefulness that he has hitherto enjoyed. I call upon you now to drink 'Lord Rosebery's health,' with all the honours."

The toast was drunk with the greatest enthusiasm, the band playing "The Heart of Midlothian."

Lord Rosebery in reply said :

"My Lord Stair, my Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I should be something less or something more than a man if I remained unmoved at your great and enthusiastic reception. More even than the address which you have been good enough to present to me do I value this great and representative gathering from all parts of Scotland, representing not merely every part of our native country, but every shade and gradation of our party, from our leader to the humblest private in our ranks. But, my Lord, I will candidly confess to you that this banquet has been something of a nightmare to me for some considerable time past. On two occasions I have successfully averted it, because I conceive that to anybody of sound sense nothing can be more distressing than a great gathering of which he in some sort may seem to be the object or the subject. And I am further distressed when I look around this great body of people, and think to myself, 'What came ye out for to see?' My Lord, I was touched and struck by the innovation

on the customary form of this entertainment—which is, that you have presented your eloquent address to me in a very beautiful casket; and when I saw that, my mind was carried back to proceedings somewhat analogous, in which I am not altogether unversed, and I felt for a moment as if you were presenting me, not with an ordinary address, but that you were giving me the freedom of the Liberal party in Scotland. That freedom, however, I claim as a birthright. I was free-born. You claim it as a birthright, and you were free-born.

“Well, gentlemen, I need not dwell further on that topic, because if we had not that birthright we should not be here to-night. But I would say one word as to the address which you have been so good as to present to me. It is not my intention to-night to say a word, or more than a word, of the topics to which that address relates, because, though I have been unable altogether to avert the honour of this great gathering, I have yet been exceptionally fortunate in this, that whereas this meeting might have been a meeting in some sort directed to myself or to local matters, the fortuitous circumstance of its being just before the general election leads us away from all individual or from all private topics. You have congratulated me, gentlemen, on the efforts that I have made for a reform of the House of Lords. But I have spoken at

such length on that subject lately that it would be almost indecent of me to refer to it again, more especially as I believe—though there is a somewhat strange alliance for leaving the House of Lords alone between a section of our party and the other party to which we are opposed—I believe I represent the feelings of this great gathering in saying that they wish for a reform of the Second Chamber. As regards the closer union with the Colonies I shall say nothing to-night, because on that I have often dilated, and because I should be imprudent, and I may add impudent, to say a word about the Colonies in the presence of Mr. Blake, who is not merely the leader of the Liberal party in Canada—and whose welcome presence here to-night shows that, however remote we may be from the federation of the Empire, yet that Liberalism all over the Empire is federated and united—who is not merely the leader of the Liberal party, but also one of Canada's most eminent statesmen, and, I believe I am correct in saying, by far her most distinguished orator. My Lord Stair, I will not deal with these subjects for another reason, which is this, that they are my pet subjects, my favourite subjects, and I want to set an example at this moment which, I believe, every one in this hall will be willing to follow, in putting aside these particular subjects which I have myself at heart wherever they may

interfere in the slightest degree with the victory of the cause to which we are all attached.

“Of the third subject of which you have treated—our own country and its administration—I may say but one sentence more. We all fought that great battle on behalf of Scottish administration. But that was not a contest of a party, much less the effort of an individual; it was the contest of a whole nation determined to see efficiency restored to its administration. I was willing enough to speak—too willing, perhaps, to speak—on that subject when the battle was raging; but now that victory has been won all along the line, it seems to me that it best becomes us to be silent. But let me say one word on the general aspect of this question as I regard it. When I, as Mr. Parnell would say, took my coat off in that cause, I did it not merely on behalf of Scottish administration, but because I believe that there is one principle with which the future of the Liberal party will have much to do, the principle that where there is a vigorous and a real and a loyal nationality, it is not wise to suppress or to ignore that nationality, and that the better policy is to satisfy its just aspirations, for by so doing you will be promoting in the highest and the best sense the efficiency of the unity of the Empire at large.

“I have said that to-night we are somewhat dispensed from speaking of our own personal and

local topics. To-night we meet less in a dining-hall than in a camp. Our watch-fires are burning brightly around us. We hear—we hear too much—the constant booming of the heavy artillery on both sides. We hear the monotonous but the agreeable cry of our sentries, ‘All’s well.’ And we have received the watchword for the combat of the morrow, which is, ‘Close your ranks.’ I believe we shall close our ranks, but I have never thought it wise on any critical occasion to ignore any difficulty that may stand in your path.”

Lord Rosebery then spoke of some feeling which had been created amongst a section of the Liberals because the Church Establishment question was not placed in the forefront of the Liberal election programme, and urged that section to remember that Mr. Gladstone came to lead a united party—“To lead it, not for those issues which are interesting beyond everything to ourselves, but which do not greatly or vitally affect the Empire at large; but for Imperial issues.”

Incidentally the speaker, referring to some Liberals who had left the party in consequence “of some mysterious menace directed by somebody in the Liberal ranks against the English Church Establishment,” said they resembled the class known in America as Mugwumps. A Mugwump he defined as a “gentleman who leaves his party on high moral principles, but under motives which are imperceptible to everybody but himself.”

Lord Rosebery continued :

“Gentlemen, you must not pay too much attention to Lord Randolph Churchill. Naturalists will tell you that it takes a wild duck forty generations to turn into a tame duck, and you cannot expect Lord Randolph Churchill to become a serious statesman all at once. But I say, What have you got to choose between? On the one side there is the Tory Government ; and what has the Tory Government got to offer you in the way of policy ? It has no policy to lay before you ; and as it has no policy to lay before you, it has taken a commanding position, and entrenched itself within the Established Church of England. The English Church is no more assailed at this election than it has been assailed at any election since 1832. But as they have no assailants they are compelled to make sorties. They are compelled to find assailants, and what do they do ? They have a very obvious mark to direct themselves against. They have the recognised programme of the Liberal party—they have the recognised leader of the Liberal party. Do they attack them ? Not a bit of it. Lord Randolph Churchill the other day, with perhaps more accuracy than reverence, compared the manifesto of Mr. Gladstone to the Authorised Version. But then, what I complain of in their party tactics is that, like a great many untrustworthy controversialists, they leave the Authorised Version

aside, and spend all their time on the commentaries and on the targums, and on the margins, and on the early fathers and on the later fathers—dealing, in fact, with every point except the vital point, dealing with every man except the real man, both of which they avoid, as fallen angels are said to avoid holy water. Gentlemen, you may make fun of this; but it shows the serious demoralisation of the Conservative party. What are they doing? They cannot attack our programme and they cannot attack our man by any fair method; so they create leaders and invent manifestoes, and then denounce them. A party which is reduced to such straits as these is not very much worth our consideration.

“What is the position of the Liberal party? The position of the Liberal party offers this attraction to the choice of a doubting Liberal, that it is a great party led by a great man, with traditions which afford security for the future, prepared and ready, if you give it your confidence, to deal with great questions. I know it is said that there are now no great questions. It is said that before the constituencies at this moment there are no questions great in the sense of the Irish Church Bill or the Reform Bill, or any other of the great critical questions of late years. I am a heretic on that point. I may be a heretic, I may be misinformed; but to my

mind there never were such questions before the country as there are at this moment. The mind is oppressed by them. The time of the next Parliament is mortgaged to them. I venture to say that never in the history of this country, to people who consider the subject soberly and seriously, were there such questions to tax the statesmanship and patriotism of Parliament as there are now.

“ But what I want to know is this : Of those who have questions which they wish to put before the public, as we all wish to put certain subjects before the public—what are the questions in our programme that you wish postponed in order to find room for your own? That is the vital question. That is the point that must be decided by any one who wishes to force any questions before the points that have been put by Mr. Gladstone in his programme. Is it the reform of the procedure of the House of Commons,—is that what you wish postponed? Now as to that, my Lord Stair, I have to make a melancholy confession. I can speak with no practical knowledge. I have never been in the House of Commons except as a spectator. I have always thought, since I took any interest in public affairs, that a man who had been in the House of Commons, and had then entered the House of Lords, and continued his interest in public affairs, was like a man with a wooden leg

trying to walk with other men. And I have still more strongly felt that the man in the House of Lords who took an interest in public affairs, and had never been in the House of Commons, was like a man with two wooden legs. I am a man with two wooden legs—but I believe that every one of the audience I am addressing is, in one sense or another, a man of business; and I venture to say that no man of business has ever taken up his paper and read the Parliamentary proceedings of the previous day without throwing it down with some muttered remark such as this, that if they cannot get through their business better than this, they had better not attempt to transact it at all.

“Is it, then, the question of procedure in the House of Commons that you wish postponed for any other question? (There were cries of ‘No.’) Then is it the question of the land? I believe that there is no question so near the heart of the constituency as the question of the land, the registration of the land, the freedom of the land, land questions not so general as to whether some relief cannot be found for those farmers, particularly men in this neighbourhood, who entered under the competition of hypothec and under high-rented leases, fixed before the Agricultural Holdings Act was passed for their benefit, and who find their spirits broken and their capital sucked away by the payment of rents that were

fixed under former systems; the question whether some relief cannot be found, as we proposed in Parliament last session, for the crofters of the Highlands. Well, all these are branches of the land question. Is it your wish the land question should be postponed? (Again there were cries of 'No.')

Well, then, gentlemen, we have the question of local government. Local government is the largest question in all its aspects that has loomed before this country for years. Local government comprises the control of the liquor traffic. It comprises a fair and responsible dealing with local affairs, so as to trouble Westminster much less, and to have your own affairs managed in your own way by your own people. Is it local government you wish postponed for any other question? Well, then, gentlemen, we come to considerations of time. We know how the last question of procedure was dealt with in the House of Commons. We know that on that occasion a session was taken up by doing very imperfectly what we shall have to do again. We may safely reckon that the procedure of the House of Commons can well take up a session. What are we to reckon for the reform of the land, for registration, which, in an old country like this, has long puzzled the lawyers, and will puzzle them yet, for the cheapening and facilitating transfer, which has long puzzled the lawyers, and will puzzle them yet, unless their

wheels be accelerated to some extent. These and other subjects I have treated, every one of which is a great subject in itself. One of them, indeed—the freeing of land—in some countries would mean a revolution; but in this country it will only mean that the time and attention of Parliament will be sedulously and lavishly given to it. Then we have local government, which is not merely a work of construction, but a work of abolition—the clearing away of those vast and complicated processes, honeycombed one over another, piled one over another from before the Norman Conquest up to to-day. Mr. Goschen, whom I see beside me, knows something of this work, and I doubt if he would give a very sanguine account of the shortness of time in which it can be got through.

“Well, gentlemen, these are the questions which are inferior questions, which can be got through apparently in a moment, because there are other questions which ought to be dealt with in preference. But I have left the greatest question to the last. As it seems to me, far from there being no questions of the future, these great subjects come rolling towards us like the waves of the Atlantic, that come straight from the shores of America to break themselves on the shores of Europe; but high above them all there comes the supreme billow of all, with appalling volume and with curling crest—the

wave of Irish demand and of Irish discontent. I do not pretend to be any judge of the procedure of the House of Commons, but I do venture to say this, that if things turn out in Ireland as we are told they will, that question will elbow and shoulder away all others, and will absorb the mind and the time and the energies of Parliament, to the exclusion of every question we may have to deal with. I do not pretend to say how that question is to be settled, but I believe it can be settled in only one direction. If you can obtain from the representatives of Ireland a clear and constitutional demand, which will represent the wishes of the people of Ireland, and which will not conflict with the unity or the supremacy of this country, I believe that by satisfying that demand, in such a way as not to need further readjustment, but to meet the just requirements of the Irish people, you will have cut off for ever the poisonous spring of discontent, and that Ireland in the future may see in this country, not her hereditary foe and her hereditary oppressor, but her best ally and her best friend.

“ These are the questions that we of the Liberal party have brought before you as a programme for this next election, and I think I have shown you cause enough to feel that the time of Parliament will be amply and fully engaged by them. After all, my Lord Stair, in point of description,

the science of politics is a very simple one. It only consists in doing the right thing at the right time. It is very easy to do the right thing at the wrong time, and it is very easy at the right time to be found doing the wrong thing. But we think we have presented before you a programme of subjects not unworthy of your acceptance. To offer a larger programme than you can accomplish is an unwise and deceptive method. But what you have to consider in regard to it is this: Are you prepared to unite with regard to that programme in achieving definite and practicable and immediate subjects, to the possible exclusion of some that are not so immediate or so practicable? Is it your wish that in the next Parliament, by sending a great Liberal majority to control the course of that Parliament, you shall have an Empire which speaks in the voice of authority abroad, or simply a weak, a powerless, an insufficient voice, which foreign Governments would know represents a Government paralysed in Parliament at home? Do you wish to deal with Ireland as a law-giver or as a huckster? Nay, is it your wish that the Liberal party should exist at all in Parliament at the next election? For that is the question. You can either have a Liberal party, or you can have what is equally interesting in some respects, more noble, but not so practical, a collection of knights-errant, all moved by their own individual

idea of chivalry, or following their own peculiar Queen of Beauty, an assembly estimable beyond everything in themselves, guided by the highest impulses, interesting as a survival, but no more able to cope with a united and disciplined party than those Paladins of the Middle Ages would have been able to meet the artillery of the nineteenth century.

“That to me, gentlemen, is the supreme question at this election. I care less for all the subjects that I have named than that; because that, after all, is the subject on which they all hinge. Do you wish to have a Liberal party or not in the next Parliament? If you do, you must send to the House of Commons an unbroken phalanx from Scotland. I hardly like to make a personal appeal to this assembly, it has shown so much kindness to me; but if I might ask you to add one more honour to these honours which you have heaped upon me, I would ask this great assembly from all parts of Scotland, that has shown so much goodwill towards me, to drop that goodwill if needs be, but to show a little goodwill to your party and to yourselves. By pressing subjects which are not authorised, which are not written on our banner, you will not advance these subjects, but you will fall into the trap of your opponents, and cripple and destroy for the moment that Liberal party through whose agency alone you can hope

at any time to achieve success. I will not ask you to waive or to suppress your highest and best instincts and principles. Wherever they are vital, you would not listen to me even if I asked you to suppress them. But I ask you not to press them to the destruction of the unity of the party when they are not vital. By so doing you can do one thing, and one alone. You can only bring what nothing else will bring—the Tories into power again. What is Tory power? What does Tory power mean? I cannot tell you. No one can tell you. Mr. Gladstone cannot tell you. They have carefully avoided giving you any honest or substantial policy. We can only gather from analogy what their policy would be. From their last administration we can gather that it would be the policy of the late Lord Beaconsfield without the late Lord Beaconsfield. That I do not think will recommend itself to you. But I know there are some who, in spite of all one can say—in spite of every appeal we can make—will say, ‘We must go forward. *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*—Let justice be done, even if the heavens fall.’ To such I would say, ‘You will not achieve your object.’ Neither will justice, in your sense, be done; nor will the heavens fall. What will be done will be Tory policy—whatever that may be. What will fall, though only for a short time, will be the Liberal party. I venture to repeat to you, as the last

sentence with which I trouble you, after having troubled you much too long—to repeat to you the sentence that I uttered at Bo'ness, and which I see opposite me now—'I speak, I have spoken, for Unity and for the Empire'—for the unity of the Liberal party, on which now more than ever, in this great crisis of our fate, when we have to deal possibly with a united and resolute Ireland, on which now more than ever depend, in my opinion—and, I doubt not, in your opinion also—the strength, and the authority, and the stability of the Empire."

Amongst the subsequent speakers at this interesting banquet were Mr. Gladstone, Mr. J. B. Balfour, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, the Marquis of Huntly, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Goschen (who proposed the toast of "The Empire"), and Mr. E. Blake. Mr. Goschen referred to Lord Rosebery as "the great Liberal Imperialist," and added:

"It is he who has made the round of the world, and who has secured the sympathies of a vast portion of our country—our English-speaking Colonies; and I believe one of the chief articles of his political creed is to draw closer the bonds of the Empire by the means of courageous sympathy—sympathy with courage, and courage with sympathy—courage which may attract the Colonies, and sympathy that may win their hearts."

Mr. Blake remarked :

"You have indeed shown in a most striking manner the hold which your noble guest has obtained upon the affections and the hearts of his fellow-countrymen ; and I am quite sure that he will be stimulated and encouraged to pursue in the future, with even still more zeal and energy than the great zeal and energy which he has exhibited in the past, his bright career. We, let me say, who live beyond the seas have not left unnoticed the career of Lord Rosebery. Bright as it has been, we have regarded it as but the prelude of better and brighter things to come, and we hope and expect for him that it will be his lot to write in action at some future day a glorious page in the history of that Empire which he loves so well."



Photo. by J. Valentine.]

BARNBOUGLE CASTLE.

CHAPTER XVII

THE 1885 ELECTION—MR. GLADSTONE AND LORD ROSEBERY—THE
TORIES AND THE PARNELLITES—THE POLITICAL UMBRELLA—"WHAT
IS A LIBERAL?"—"I AM A FOLLOWER OF MR. GLADSTONE"—
LIBERAL IMPERIALISM DEFINED—THE FREEDOM OF KILMARNOCK—
MR. GLADSTONE AND IRELAND—MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S "UNAUTHORISED
PROGRAMME"—THE RESULT OF THE ELECTION—IRISH SUCCESSES
—THE TORY GOVERNMENT—MR. GLADSTONE RETURNS TO POWER

POLITICAL events in the year 1885 were many and interesting. Lord Salisbury had determined to accept office, and set about the Cabinet making process; but it was by no means an easy task, and before it was completed Sir Stafford Northcote was made Earl of Iddesleigh, and Lord Randolph Churchill became Secretary for India. The new Government allowed the Crimes Act in Ireland to lapse, and negotiations took place between the Conservatives and the Parnellites, and an agreement was come to which led to a great deal of comment. Preparations were meanwhile being made by the two political parties for the coming general election. Lord Rosebery went down to Edinburgh on June 29, and presided at a meeting of the Midlothian Liberal Association held in

the Queen Street Hall. A very interesting letter was read to the meeting. It was a direct reference to the coming political greatness of the Earl. The letter was addressed to Mr. John Cowan, chairman of the committee of the Association. Mr. Gladstone wrote :

"I rejoice that you meet under the presidency of my friend and late colleague, Lord Rosebery, who has to play, if his life be spared, an important part in the future politics of the United Kingdom."

Lord Rosebery, in the course of his speech, referred sarcastically to the recent defeat of the late Government in the House of Commons, which had resulted in the advent of a Conservative Government to office for the remainder of the session, as effected by "the combination, the holy and righteous combination, of the Conservative party and the Parnellite party—parties which had much in common, no doubt, but which had not always professed the same principles." He disclaimed any wish on the part of the Liberal party to harass the new administration.

It was in this speech that he introduced the allusion to the political umbrella, which, as will be gathered from the speech made in September at Reigate, attracted some attention among political controversialists. The passage, which occurs in a portion of the speech dealing with differences—such as those indicated by the terms Whig and

Radical—existing in the ranks of the Liberal Party, reads as follows :

"When I ask myself what is a Liberal, I remember that the name of Liberal is good enough for Mr. Gladstone, is good enough for Mr. Bright, and I am quite willing to walk under an umbrella with those two gentlemen."

He proceeded to define a Liberal :—"What is a Liberal? As far as I know what a Liberal is, to judge from my own experience, it is this, that we wish to move in company with the great mass of the nation, rather in front of them than behind them."

On July 10, 1885, the Duke of Argyll rose to call the attention of the House of Lords to the circumstances attending the recent change of administration, and to the effects of them on the political prospects of the country, and in the course of a long speech passed some criticism on the recent speech of Lord Rosebery, delivered at Edinburgh in connection with the Midlothian Liberal Association.

Lord Rosebery in his reply poked some good-humoured fun at his august critic, and took occasion to defend the definition of Liberalism which he had given in his Edinburgh speech. He said : The noble Duke rebukes me very much for saying that my definition of Liberalism was a 'movement with and in front of national movements.' Well, my lords, I am quite willing to adhere to that

definition. I do not mean fortuitous, or occasional, or temporary national movements, but great national movements which are unmistakable, and which, if we do not place ourselves in front of them and move with them, will move over us."

Neither Lord Rosebery nor any other politician is likely to forget the "Liberal umbrella" he created. It was just one of those things that give a pleasant, light touch to an election. It was mentioned everywhere. On September 28, 1885, Lord Rosebery addressed a meeting at the Drill Hall, Reigate. Lord Monson, who presided, made allusion to the Primrose League, and reminded the audience that the Liberals had also their Primrose, who was about to address them. Lord Rosebery, on rising to speak, humorously took up the reference, complaining of the Tories attempting to obtain votes under the shelter of an honest though humble Liberal name. He passed on to refer to the attention bestowed on a sentence occurring in a speech delivered at Edinburgh some time previously :

"Now I speak to you to-night as the greatest benefactor of the human race that has existed for some time. For the last two months I have furnished to the speakers on every platform a figure of speech, a metaphor, which has been of incalculable use to them. That figure of speech has reference to a useful domestic instrument—I mean the political umbrella. That umbrella

has furnished an innocent source of delight to many thousands of my fellow-countrymen. I am extremely sick of the word; but, useful as I always knew an umbrella to be, I never knew how useful it might grow until I read recent speeches of my opponents. I was brought up in the belief that it is always dangerous to leave one's umbrella in a front hall, but it has only been in middle and declining age that I have learnt how dangerous it is to introduce an umbrella into a speech. But, in spite of all the reproaches that have been levelled at me in consequence of my reference to this innocent instrument, I still cling firmly to its handle. I know what that declaration means, and I am proud of it. It means that I am a follower of Mr. Gladstone."

Lord Rosebery dealt also with general political questions, and made reference to the desirability of Parliament limiting the hours of labour, in connection with which he made special allusion to the long hours of railway workers.

During this autumn Lord Rosebery seemed to be speaking everywhere. The charm of his eloquence was famous, and he was in great request. On September 10, 1885, a farewell banquet was given in the New Hall, Beaconsfield, by Mr. E. L. Lawson, in honour of Lord Carrington, who was shortly to proceed to Australia as Governor of New South Wales. Lord Rosebery, who was

among the guests, proposed the toast of "The Empire." They had met, he said, in a county which, according to the proper boast of Lord Beaconsfield, had been the mother of so many Prime Ministers and so many Chancellors of the Exchequer, to send forth in the person of their distinguished guest an emissary to take part in the great work of the Empire. And when he mentioned Ministers and Chancellors of the Exchequer he could not forget that most distinguished man who had lived in the neighbourhood, that giant who seemed to him to outweigh all their Ministers and all their Chancellors of the Exchequer—the man of Beaconsfield—the great Mr. Burke. If Mr. Burke could have been there now he would have rejoiced to see such honours paid by the county of Bucks to one of Buckinghamshire's most distinguished sons. But he would have rejoiced also because of the large interest which he took in the widest and the most far-seeing sense in the Empire. The word "Empire" was a tempting one to an advocate of Imperial Federation. . . . He was an advocate of Imperial Federation, not in any party sense, because it was no party question. The committee and association which were interested in that matter were no party committee and no party association, but were composed of men of both sides, who were willing to forget the petty rivalries—as they often were—of party life. But upon that question depended the future connection of Great Britain

and her colonies, and on the question whether the tie became closer or looser depended the future position of this country among the nations of the world. . . . He thought that that evening they had given a signal proof of their wishes for the future of the Empire. Were they not sending out one of their best men to help to govern the Empire?

The Times of September 11, 1885, published a letter written by Lord Rosebery to a Scotch correspondent on the subject of Disestablishment. In it he deprecated making the question of the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland a test question at the approaching general election, the main issue of which was whether the country should be ruled for the next six years by Liberal or Conservative methods. It was a question for the people of Scotland to settle, but was not ripe for settlement just then.

In the middle of September Lord Rosebery paid a brief visit to Mr. Gladstone, at Hawarden Castle; and then, no doubt refreshed and strengthened by the political conference with his venerable chief, he entered upon a new and still greater period of public speaking. At Paisley, on October 15, he spoke chiefly upon Ireland and the Colonies. He dwelt upon the fact that the Irish problem had assumed a new and serious phase owing to the unavowed alliance between the Conservatives and the Parnellites, and urged the importance of the electors sinking minor differences at the general election,

and taking care that that alliance, which involved a danger to the Empire, should be fruitless. Dealing with the proposal of Mr. Parnell for the establishment of an Irish Parliament, Ireland to have the status of a colony with the Crown as the only link between Great Britain and Ireland, he pointed out that, while the Colonies were loyal, Ireland unfortunately was not loyal. Large developments of Home Rule or local government, which he regarded as meaning the same thing, were approaching. The future, if it involved an Ireland in federal relations with Great Britain, might also involve a larger federalism in which the colonies would have their share.

In his peroration Lord Rosebery struck a note of Liberal Imperialism :

“To us Liberals I hold the Empire is most dear. To whom else can it well be so dear, for it is under us and under our party—under the guidance of our party for almost all the last fifty years of unparalleled power and unparalleled prosperity—that the Empire has reached its present position. We and our fathers have made it what it is. We saved it from the horrors of civil war in 1832 ; we saved it from the horrors of revolution in 1848 ; we saved it, not by blindly resisting all changes until the demand for them became overwhelming, but by acknowledging and forwarding and even anticipating the just wishes of the people. In 1885 we were enabled to set a seal to these

measures of advancement. Outside the United Kingdom what have the Liberal party done for the Empire? They struck the chains off the slaves; they put an end to the system by which our fairest colonies were flooded with the refuse of civilisation—our convicts. We gave them Home Rule; we have favoured and fostered that commerce which is our most practical link with them at the present moment; and, having so saved and developed it, I hope and believe we will yet be permitted to broaden and strengthen the foundations of that noble structure by basing them on the affection, sympathy, and intelligence of the scattered but united races of the Empire."

Lord Rosebery was presented with the freedom of Kilmarnock on October 17. Three days later he was at Sheffield at the opening of the Reform Club, and his speech on that occasion is specially interesting at the time of the publication of this work, inasmuch as it contains his definition of the term "Liberal Imperialist": "The other day I was described, and I think truly described, as a Liberal Imperialist. So far as I understand these two long words, that is a perfectly accurate description. If a Liberal Imperialist means that I am a Liberal who is passionately attached to the Empire, and interested intensely in the best means of sustaining and promoting the interests of the Empire,—if it means, as I believe it does, that I am a Liberal who believes that the Empire is

best maintained upon the basis of the widest democracy, and that the voice is most powerful when it represents the greatest number of persons and subjects,—if these be accurate descriptions of what a Liberal Imperialist is, then I am a Liberal Imperialist, and I believe that you are Liberal Imperialists too.” In the same speech, touching upon the hours of labour, Lord Rosebery disclaimed any particular wish to interfere with the hours of labour all round, believing that trades unions could act in this direction better than the Legislature. There were, however, exceptional cases, among which were the hours of railwaymen. He urged that to secure an efficient House of Commons, under the present circumstances, it was necessary to give the Liberal party an overwhelming majority over the Conservatives and the Parnellites combined. To this end unity among Liberals of various degrees was essential.

Amongst the interesting incidents of the electoral campaign was what became generally known as the “Unauthorised Programme,” issued by Mr. Chamberlain, whose influence in the Liberal ranks was at the time very great. “Three acres and a cow” also made their appearance in speeches and on hoardings throughout the country. Mr. Gladstone, after a pleasant voyage on the *Sunbeam* with its notable owner, Sir Thomas (now Lord) Brassey, returned to Hawarden Castle and issued his address to the electors of Midlothian. London

Government and Local Government throughout the country, land registration, and licensing reform were matters that pressed for attention. In the concluding portion of the address came the all-important matter of Ireland :

“ I have reserved until the close the mention of Ireland. The change just effected in our representative system is felt to have been a large one even in Great Britain, but is of far wider scope in Ireland, where the mass of the people in boroughs as well as counties have for the first time, by the free and almost unsolicited gift of the Legislature, been called to exercise the Parliamentary franchise. They will thus in the coming Parliament have improved means of making known through the Irish members their views and wishes on public affairs. Without doubt we have arrived at an important epoch in her history, which it behoves us to meet in a temper of very serious and dispassionate reflection. Those grievances of Ireland with which we have been historically too familiar before and since the Union have at length been happily removed. . . . But the wants of Ireland have to be considered as well as its grievances. In my opinion, not now for the first time delivered, the limit is clear within which any desires of Ireland, constitutionally ascertained, may, and beyond which they cannot, receive the assent of Parliament. To maintain the supremacy of the Crown, the unity of the

Empire, and all the authority of Parliament necessary for the conservation of that unity, is the first duty of every representative of the people. Subject to this governing principle every grant to portions of the country of enlarged powers for the management of their own affairs is, in my view, not a source of danger but a means of averting it, and is in the nature of a new guarantee for increased cohesion, happiness, and strength. We have no right to expect that the remedial process in human affairs shall always be greatly shorter than the period of mistakes and misgovernment, and if in the case of Ireland half a century of efforts at redress, not always consistent or sustained, and following upon long ages for which as a whole we blush, have still left something to be attempted, we ought not to wax weary in well doing nor rest until every claim which justice may be found to urge shall have been satisfied. The main question is whether it is for the interests of all the three countries that the thorough and enduring harmony which has now long been established, but only after centuries of manful strife, between England and Scotland, should include Ireland also. My personal answer to the question is this. I believe history and posterity will consign to disgrace the name and memory of every man, be he who he may, and on whichever side of the Channel he may dwell, that having the power to aid in an equitable

settlement between Ireland and Great Britain shall use that power not to aid but to prevent or to retard it."

That reference to Ireland in Mr. Gladstone's address did not at the time attract the attention it deserved, nor was its significance recognised. Liberal leaders were, on the whole, thinking of other matters about which their differences were considerable, owing largely, it is most interesting to note in the light of subsequent events, to what were deemed to be the dangerously advanced views of Mr. Chamberlain.

Some prominent Liberals fled from the party because they feared the socialism promulgated from Birmingham. Lord Rosebery had, however, always looked to the extension of local government as the panacea of a good many evils, for Ireland as for other parts of the kingdom. His remarks at a banquet in Melbourne in 1884 had caused political writers in that country even then to connect Lord Rosebery's name with Home Rule. Ireland and local government had always been questions very near to one another, to Lord Rosebery's mind, and in several speeches delivered during the autumn of 1885 he made references to the subject. He had this in mind when he enunciated the principle that, wherever a vigorous, real, and loyal nationality exists, it is not wise to suppress or ignore that nationality. "Satisfy its just aspirations," he said, "and so promote

the efficiency and unity of the Empire. I do not pretend to say how the question of Ireland is to be settled, but I believe it can be settled in only one direction, if you can obtain from the representatives of Ireland a clear and constitutional demand, which will represent the wishes of the people of Ireland, and which will not conflict with the unity and supremacy of England." By conceding the just demands of the Irish people, it was Lord Rosebery's purpose to "cut off for ever the poisonous spring of discontent," and to make Ireland England's greatest ally and friend. As long ago as June 1885 he urged that almost every experiment had been tried in Ireland, and had failed more or less conspicuously, and he hinted that the experiment of the future would have to be in the direction of giving Ireland control of her own affairs. His special remedy for discontent was a liberal measure of local self-government all round, with special and exceptional treatment for Ireland.

The Midlothian election campaign included the banquet at which the Scottish Liberals entertained Lord Rosebery, an account of which has previously been given. The campaign wound up in November. Notwithstanding the references to Ireland made by Mr. Gladstone in his address and in his speeches, Mr. Parnell had been persuaded that he was going to get more out of the Tories than out of Mr. Gladstone. The

Irish leader issued manifestoes "proclaiming that every Irishman who voted for the Liberals was doing his best to deliver his countrymen to imprisonment and death." That declaration lost the Liberal party a substantial number of seats. The result of the election was to make the Irish members the masters of the situation, and ensured early attention to Irish affairs.

The Tories found themselves, by the help of their Irish allies, successful in the towns beyond all their hopes; the Liberals, disappointed in the boroughs, had found compensation in unexpected successes in the counties; and the Irish Nationalists had almost swept the board. When the gains and losses of the battle came to be summed up it was found that the English boroughs had returned 114 Tories and only 111 Liberals; but that the balance had been redressed by Wales and Scotland. The boroughs of the Principality had elected two Tories and nine Liberals; and those of the Northern Kingdom one Tory and 30 Liberals. The borough representation of Great Britain was therefore 150 Liberals to 117 Conservatives. In the English counties the Liberals had got 134 seats to 100 which had been kept by the Tories; Wales followed with 18 Liberals and one Tory, and Scotland with 32 Liberals and seven Tories. With one Liberal and four Conservatives for the University seats, the English representation—exclusive of one Irish Nationalist

for Liverpool—gave a Liberal majority of 28 in the English constituencies; which Wales and Scotland swelled to 106. The Irish representation had undergone a still more remarkable change. Of 103 members for the sister island, 85 were Home Rulers and only 18 were Tories. Adding one Irish Nationalist for England, and two Tories for the Scotch Universities, the new House of Commons was exactly divided between the Liberals on one side, and the Tories with their Irish allies on the other. Of its 670 members just one-half, or 335, were Liberals, 249 were Tories, and 86 were Irish Nationalists.

Lord Salisbury, of course, took office, and then the obvious disagreements in the Liberal party began to attract attention. Mr. Chamberlain's "unauthorised programme" undoubtedly had some considerable influence on the election, and the question "Gladstone or Chamberlain?" began to be asked.

It was recognised that, as the result of the 1885 election, attention would have to be given to the Irish question. On December 12, the day after the last returns from the Irish constituencies had been announced, *The Daily News* began its first leading article with the words, "We are brought face to face with the question of Home Rule in Ireland, and we cannot doubt that it has already engaged the attention of Liberal statesmen." Further on in the same article *The Daily*

News remarked, "Why should not a small Committee formed of both political parties, and including, of course, a proper representation of Mr. Parnell's party, be brought together to consider, not whether Ireland ought or ought not to have some sort of domestic Legislature, but what sort of domestic Legislature it would be wise and safe to give her? Since some such arrangement has to be made, it seems to us that this is at least one practical way in which it might be approached and even accomplished." Five days later, on December 17, Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at the Birmingham Reform Club, said: "I have hoped—I have expressed publicly the desire—that the two democracies, the English and the Irish, moved by common aspiration and sympathetic appreciation, should march shoulder to shoulder along the paths of political freedom and progress. Mr. Parnell, indeed," Mr. Chamberlain said, "had alienated and embittered all sections of the Liberal party; but," he continued, "national questions of grave importance must not be prejudiced by personal considerations. We are face to face with a very remarkable demonstration of the Irish people. They have shown that as far as regards the great majority of them they are earnestly in favour of a change in the administration of their Government, and of some system which would give them a larger control of their domestic affairs. Well, we ourselves, by our public declarations and by our Liberal

principles, are pledged to acknowledge the substantial justice of the claim." Mr. Chamberlain then spoke of rumours of negotiations between the Liberal leaders and Mr. Parnell, which he declared, so far as he was concerned, to be false, and he thought that as they affected other prominent members of the Liberal party they were equally groundless. "As to Mr. Gladstone," he continued, "we know what his opinion is from his public utterances. He has again and again said that the first duty of Liberal statesmen is to maintain the integrity of the Empire and the supremacy of the Crown; but that, subject to that, he was prepared to give the largest possible measure of Local Government that could be conceived or proposed. Well, I entirely agree with those principles, and I have so much faith in the experience and patriotism of Mr. Gladstone, that I cannot doubt that if he should ever see his way to propose any scheme of arrangement, I shall be able conscientiously to give it my humble support. But it is right, it is due to the Irish people, to say that all sections of the Liberal party, Radicals as much as Whigs, are determined that the integrity of the Empire shall be a reality, and not an empty phrase.

It was on the day Mr. Chamberlain spoke that an anonymous paragraph appeared stating that Mr. Gladstone was prepared to deal in a liberal spirit with the demand for Home Rule. The paragraph which became known as "The Hawarden Kite,"

was described by Mr. Gladstone as an "anonymous and irresponsible declaration." Still the discussion went on. It was said that Mr. Gladstone had been at work upon a scheme for restoring the Irish Parliament, and an outline of the scheme was published in *The Leeds Mercury*. Mr. Gladstone at once repudiated it. "It is not an accurate representation of my views," said Mr. Gladstone, "but is, I presume, a speculation upon them. It is not published with my knowledge or authority, nor is any other beyond my own public declarations." Lord Hartington also issued a disclaimer; and Mr. John Morley, speaking at Newcastle on the shortest day, declared that the published scheme was the guess of "some enterprising newspaper gentlemen," and that "anybody could see at first blush that it was not a scheme that a man of Mr. Gladstone's knowledge and experience would launch in any way." In a forcible argument, based on the expression of Irish feeling at the polls, Mr. Morley passed in review the various plans for dealing with the Irish difficulty; and said, "I am, for one, forced to the conclusion that before many weeks are over you will see Parliament driven by irresistible circumstances to consider the giving to Ireland of some plan for a greatly extended government of herself." Glancing at the many difficulties in the way, Mr. Morley in a prophetic moment said: "The task will be a long one. It will stir deep passions, it will perhaps destroy a great party.

But whatever may be the outcome, I say it is the duty of every one of us Liberals to view the question as calmly as he can, and steadfastly feeling that he is discharging as urgent a duty as has been imposed on English citizens since the civil wars of the seventeenth century." It was a trying time for Liberals. Some of the leaders—but very few—were taken into Mr. Gladstone's confidence. The remainder were left unguided to inspect the Kite. Meanwhile they were already disturbed by conflicting feelings. Mr. Chamberlain's "unauthorised programme" appealed to a goodly number. There were, in fact, at this time two sections—the Gladstonian and the Chamberlain—in the Liberal party, and when the split came this helped to widen the breach and make it impassable. The Conservatives at the same time were supposed to be flirting with Home Rule, and the situation at the time has been described in an interesting way by Mr. Clayden.* It was rumoured, and openly stated, that Lord Carnarvon had been negotiating with the Irish Nationalists as to a measure of Home Rule.

Lord Carnarvon emphatically denied that he had ever officially communicated with any Irish members, or consulted them as to proposals which were before the Cabinet; but he carefully avoided saying that he had not given them an outline of

* *England under the Coalition.* By P. W. Clayden. T. Fisher Unwin.

his own scheme, which he told the House of Lords was one for "united self-government." The Ministry had before them at Christmas a definite statement of Mr. Gladstone's views, as to the way in which the Irish question should be treated. He had met Mr. Arthur Balfour at Eaton Hall, the Duke of Westminster's Cheshire residence, about the middle of December, and they had chatted in the familiar confidence of private life, and in an entirely informal way, about the state of Ireland, and the change that the election had made in the Irish representation. In the course of the talk Mr. Gladstone expressed the opinion that if some substantial concession was not quickly made to the demands of the Irish people, as expressed by their representatives, the party of violence would take the matter up and there might be renewed attempts to enforce their demands by outrages in England. Mr. Balfour, according to his own version of the story, remarked: "In other words, we are to be blown up and stabbed if we do not grant Home Rule by the end of the session." In the same spirit Mr. Gladstone replied, with a laugh, "I understand that the time is shorter than that." Mr. Gladstone subsequently wrote to Mr. Balfour—"On reflection, I think that what I said to you in our conversation at Eaton may have amounted to the conveyance of a hope that the Government would take a strong and early decision on the Irish question. For I spoke of the stir in

men's minds, and of the urgency of the matter, to both of which every day's post brings me new testimony. This being so, I wish, under the very peculiar circumstances of the case, to go a step further, and say that I think it will be a public calamity if this great subject should fall into the lines of party conflict. I feel sure the question can only be dealt with by a Government, and I desire, specially on grounds of public policy, that it should be dealt with by the *present* Government. If, therefore, they bring in a proposal for settling the whole question of the future Government of Ireland, my desire will be, reserving, of course, necessary freedom, to treat it in the same spirit in which I have endeavoured to proceed in respect to Afghanistan and with respect to the Balkan Peninsula."

This letter was written on December 20, 1885, and Mr. Balfour replied to it on the 22nd. "I have, as yet, had no opportunity of showing it to Lord Salisbury, or of consulting him as to its contents, but I am sure he will receive without surprise the statement of your earnest hope that the Irish question should not fall into the lines of party conflict. If the ingenuity of any Ministry is sufficient to devise some adequate and lasting remedy for the chronic ills of Ireland, I am certain it will be the wish of the leaders of the Opposition, to whichever side they may belong, to treat the question as a national and not as a party one,

though I fear that under our existing Parliamentary system this will not prove so easy when we are dealing with an integral portion of the United Kingdom, as it proved when we were concerned with the remote regions of Roumelia and Afghanistan." Mr. Gladstone replied on the next day that, while expressing a desire that the Government should act, he was not himself acting; that so long as he entertained the hope connected with that wish he should not publicly state his views, but only make known his anxiety that the Government should decide and act in this great matter. Mr. Balfour answered that he had shown Mr. Gladstone's last letter to Lord Salisbury, who wished to express his great sense of the courteous and conciliatory spirit in which it was written. He thought, however, that it would be better not to communicate the views of the Government, but to wait till Parliament met. Mr. Gladstone quite agreed with this remark, and said he had not suggested any such communication. When this correspondence was published, in the midst of the election preparations in 1886, Mr. Balfour intimated that there was nothing in it which indicated what plans Mr. Gladstone had in his mind, and that he only assumed Home Rule to be meant in consequence of the unauthorised rumour as to Mr. Gladstone having thought out a Home Rule scheme which was published in *The Leeds Mercury*.

The correspondence undoubtedly seems to show

that party leaders were prepared to negotiate, and the Irish question might then have been settled once and for all finally and satisfactorily. But party leaders and parties are not exactly the same thing. If Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour were prepared to grant a Home Rule scheme, the bulk of their colleagues and the mass of their party were not, and the Conservative leaders were in a quandary. Mr. Parnell's action at the election had gained many seats for Tory candidates by Irish votes ; and the Tory Government now depended upon Irish votes in Parliament for its very existence. If the Irish Nationalists in the House of Commons withdrew their support from the Tories and remained neutral, it meant that the Government would be in a minority of eighty-six. If the Irish Nationalists voted against them the Government were in a minority of one hundred and seventy-two. Gratitude for help at the election, and expediency alike, dictated concessions to the Irish Nationalists ; but in the end those dictates were not followed, Lord Carnarvon's Irish scheme was dropped, and the Conservative Ministry in consequence met Parliament with the certainty of a speedy defeat. Instead of Home Rule the Queen's Speech talked of coercion.

The opening of Parliament led amongst other things to the settlement of the Bradlaugh question. It had been intended to make Sir Matthew White Ridley the Speaker of the new House. He

had, however, been defeated at the polls, and then the Government then proposed to elect Mr. Arthur Peel, whose appointment was unanimous. On the first day of the new Parliament the Bradlaugh question was settled. As soon as the Speaker had taken the oath he announced that he had received a letter from the Chancellor of the Exchequer urging that Mr. Bradlaugh should not be allowed to take the oath. In reply the Speaker announced that he could not allow any interference with Mr. Bradlaugh if he wished to be sworn. "When a member comes to this table," said the Speaker, "and offers to take the oath, I know no right whatever to intervene between him and the form of legal and statutable obligation." The Chancellor of the Exchequer, rising amid Tory cheers and Liberal cries of "Order," made two futile attempts to raise a debate or to make a protest, but was at once stopped by the Speaker ; and the long controversy over Mr. Bradlaugh was thus at an end.

Meanwhile the fall of the Government was getting nearer. Lord Carnarvon resigned the Viceroyalty of Ireland, and Mr. W. H. Smith was made Chief Secretary in the place of Sir William Hart-Dyke. Mr. Smith apparently was a convenient buffer between the two Tory sections—those who favoured coercion, and those who wanted to conciliate the Irish members by a liberal measure of local government. Mr. Smith left

for Ireland, and it was stated in the House of Commons by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach that he (Mr. Smith) intended to give his "immediate and earnest attention" to the question whether the Irish problem could be dealt with under the ordinary law or whether additional powers would be necessary. No Irish Secretary ever held office for so brief a period. On Saturday, January 23, 1886, Mr. Smith attended a meeting of the Cabinet. He forthwith left for Ireland, and reached Dublin on Sunday. He attended Lord Carnarvon's *levée* on Monday, was sworn in before the Privy Council on Tuesday, and on Tuesday night left Dublin for London. On the Monday evening Lord Salisbury announced in the House of Lords that within forty-eight hours the Government would introduce its proposals to remedy "the terrible and scandalous state of things" in Ireland. On Tuesday evening, as Mr. Smith was starting on his journey from Dublin, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that on Thursday, January 28, the Chief Secretary would introduce a Coercion Bill for Ireland, and that the land question would subsequently be dealt with. The Government, seeing defeat coming, would have liked the test question to be that of Ireland. In that they were disappointed. It was an item in the "unauthorised programme" of Mr. Chamberlain, and not the question of Home Rule, which was to defeat the Government and

show the dividing line in the Liberal party. Before the Tuesday evening was over, Mr. Jesse Collings moved an amendment to the Address, expressing regret that the Government had proposed no measure for providing agricultural labourers with allotments. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain supported it. So did Mr. Arch, who delivered on the occasion an excellent maiden speech. Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen vigorously opposed the amendment, but it was carried by a majority of three hundred and twenty-nine Liberals, Radicals, and Irish Nationalists against two hundred and fifty Conservatives and Whigs—a difference of seventy-nine. "Don't forget coercion on Thursday!" was shouted from the Irish benches; and, in fact, on the night coercive measures had been promised, Lord Salisbury went down to Osborne and tendered the resignations of himself and his Cabinet, which were accepted. On the following Monday it was announced in Parliament that the Government had resigned, and that Mr. Gladstone was forming an administration. Both Houses adjourned till Thursday, when Mr. Arnold Morley, Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, who was heartily cheered on making his first appearance at the table of the House in that capacity, moved the writs. On the following Saturday the Tory Government gave up the seals of office and the Gladstone Ministry went down to Osborne and received them.

The few days that Mr. Smith occupied the


502 Lord Roseberg: His Life and Speeches

position of Chief Secretary for Ireland produced from Mr. Alexander Paul some amusing and sarcastic lines on the position of the Cabinet regarding him.

DIALOGUE OF THE DAY.

- LORD GRANVILLE. Your Irish policy is dark,
Elucidatory remark
Is wanted to explain its pith.
- MINISTERS. Wait till we hear from Mr. Smith.
- MR. GLADSTONE. Strategic cunning that may be,
But Ireland's dire extremity
Requires that you should act forthwith.
- MINISTERS. Wait till we hear from Mr. Smith.
- LORD GRANVILLE. But this obscure coercion hint
Which, read by light of Tory print,
Seems like a party shibboleth?
- MINISTERS. Wait till we hear from Mr. Smith.
- LORD KIMBERLEY. But what about Carnarvon then?
Saith he not whether, where, and when
You need coerce our kin and kith?
- MINISTERS. Oh, wait to hear from Mr. Smith.
- THE ORANGE MEMBERS. Well, *we* dislike this foil and fence,
And work postponed on such pretence.
Is your coercion plan a myth?
- MINISTERS. Be patient till we hear from Smith.
- GENERAL CHORUS. They have no words to greet us with
But "wait to hear from Mr. Smith."

END OF VOL. I.



A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW.

3675482

CANCELLED
MAR 6 72H

47
APR 10 1976
MAR 10 75H



3 2044 090 348 558

